arXiv:1001.2622v3 [math-ph] 21 Sep 2011

Supersymmetric C^*-dynamical systems

Hajime Moriya*

21 SEP 2011

Abstract

A mathematical approach to supersymmetry based on the use of C^*-algebras is given. We introduce two classes of supersymmetric C^*-dynamical systems that roughly correspond to fermion lattice models with hidden supersymmetry and to supersymmetric quantum field theories. Each of them is studied in details with some concrete examples provided. We show several fundamental properties of supersymmetric states which are stated in terms of the cyclic representations of these states.

Key Words. Supersymmetry. C^*-algebra.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 Notation **6**

3 Supersymmetric C^*-dynamics **11**

3.1 The case of strongly continuous dynamical systems; Case (I) 11

3.2 The case of weakly continuous dynamical systems; Case (II) 15

4 Supercharge operators for supersymmetric states **18**

5 Representation of the supersymmetry algebra under unbroken supersymmetry **22**

5.1 Preliminaries for Case (I) 22

5.2 Preliminaries for Case (II) 28

5.3 Self-adjointness of supercharges and the supersymmetry algebra realized in the GNS space 31

6 Set of supersymmetric states **34**

7 Supercharges affiliated to the von Neumann algebra **36**

---

*Email: map56@river.plala.or.jp SIT Japan.

8 Examples **37**
8.1 Case (I); a class of supersymmetric fermion lattice models 37
8.2 Case (II); a supersymmetric quantum field model 52

1 Introduction

This paper presents a C^{*}-algebraic approach to supersymmetry. Supersymmetry -symmetry between fermions and bosons- is not only a remarkable theoretical idea in particle physics, it has influenced many branches of physics and mathematics. We aim to shed light on general mathematical structure induced by supersymmetry through analysis using C^{*}-algebraic methods.

Among the extensive literature on supersymmetry, there has been some, but not a lot of, work done in the context of mathematically rigorous infinite dimensional analysis, specifically functional analysis. This paper is largely indebted to [1] that studied the implementation of supersymmetry in a Hilbert space under a C^{*}-algebraic setting. We will employ similar formulation and notation as used there. We have also been motivated by [2] that extensively discussed several aspects of supersymmetry (among other symmetries) in the axiomatic quantum field theory. This mathematical formalism of relativistic quantum field theory utilizes *unbounded* field operators in a Hilbert space [3]. On the other hand, the elements in C^{*}-algebras are all *bounded*. Such a difference turns out to be crucial in dealing with supersymmetry, at least technically, as we will later indicate.

The mathematical formalism that describes quantum systems by making use of C^{*}-algebras may be referred to as C^{*}-algebraic quantum physics. It has offered mathematically solid frameworks for treating physical models of infinitely many degrees of freedom. The consequences of C^{*}-algebraic quantum physics both for quantum field theory and statistical mechanics are collected in [4, 5, 6, 7], see also the bibliographies therein. Our main purpose is to extend the scope of C^{*}-algebraic quantum physics and apply it to supersymmetry which has until now escaped systematic investigation from this viewpoint.

We shall formulate C^{*}-dynamical systems that are supersymmetric. Clearly the C^{*}-algebra lacks some ingredients of the superfield formalism (such as auxiliary fields and Grassmann parameters) by which supersymmetric Lagrangians can be efficiently written, see e.g. [8, 9]. We are not able to reproduce supersymmetric quantum field models which abundantly exist in the physics literature in our C^{*}-algebraic formalism. Admittedly this is a big defect that will not be easily overcome. We note, however, that the assumptions imposed on our statements are so general that they do not appear to conflict with concrete physical models in the literature.

In this paper, we do not restrict our attention to relativistic quantum field theory. 'Supersymmetry' is used in a broader sense than its original sense, i.e. symmetry between the particles with the same properties (such as mass) other than the spins which differ by half a unit of spin. This C^{*}-algebraic study may serve purely abstract investigation on supersymmetry, though its present achievement as a physical theory is quite limited due to the lack of non-trivial quantum field models fitting into our formalism[1].

The general algebraic relation of supersymmetry is determined by seminar work [11] (under some physical constrains on S-matrix in relativistic quantum field theory). Let us recall the $N=1$ supersymmetry algebra in $0+1$ dimensions. This simple supersymmetry algebra will be later formulated as C^*-dynamical systems. Let Q and Q^* be a conjugate pair of linear operators in a Hilbert space. The asterisk $*$ will be used for the hermite adjoint of operators. These Q and Q^* denote supercharge operators. They are assumed nilpotent:

$$Q^2 = {Q^*}^2 = 0. \tag{1.1}$$

The supersymmetric Hamiltonian is given as

$$H = \{Q,\ Q^*\} = QQ^* + Q^*Q. \tag{1.2}$$

Hence the Hamiltonian H is positive. From (1.1) and (1.2) it follows that

$$[H,\ Q] = [H,\ Q^*] = 0. \tag{1.3}$$

Let $Q_{\mathrm{s},1} := Q + Q^*$ and $Q_{\mathrm{s},1} := i(Q - Q^*)$, which are self-adjoint. We see

$$H = Q_{\mathrm{s},1}^2 = Q_{\mathrm{s},1}^2. \tag{1.4}$$

All eigenstates with a non-zero eigenvalue for the supersymmetric Hamiltonian H form the doublets under supersymmetry. Namely, a pair of rays $\{|f\rangle, Q|f\rangle\}$ satisfying $Q^*|f\rangle = 0$ have the same positive eigenvalue for H, where $|f\rangle$ corresponds to a fermionic state while $Q|f\rangle$ corresponds to a bosonic state.

If there exists a state represented by a unit ray $|0\rangle$ that is annihilated by the supercharges,

$$Q|0\rangle = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad Q^*|0\rangle = 0, \tag{1.5}$$

then it is said that supersymmetry is unbroken. As the Hilbert space is positive definite, by (1.2) (1.4), (1.5) is equivalent to

$$H|0\rangle = 0, \tag{1.6}$$

and also to

$$Q_{\mathrm{s},1}|0\rangle = 0, \tag{1.7}$$

---

[1] It is straightforward to write down a supersymmetric version of Local quantum physics (Algebraic quantum field theory) [4] as in [10]. There are, however, lots to be clarified, such as making connections with actual physical models, forming appropriate axioms and so on.

$$Q_{\mathrm{s},2}|0\rangle = 0. \tag{1.8}$$

Otherwise, if no such $|0\rangle$ exists, then it is said that supersymmetry is broken. It is often rephrased that VEV (the vacuum expectation value) is the order for supersymmetry breaking; if VEV is strictly positive, then supersymmetry is broken, if VEV is equal to zero, then supersymmetry is unbroken.

In the above introduction to the supersymmetry algebra, supercharges are assumed to exist as (densely defined) linear operators in a Hilbert space and the algebraic relations (1.1) (1.2) are fulfilled from the outset. This seems "at the very best heuristic" [12, Appendix A] and could lead to erroneous consequences as warned of in [13]. In practice, however, there is nothing noteworthy in physics according to the basic wisdom of quantum field theory: (super)charges given as the spacial integration of the time-component of a locally conserved (super)symmetry current are ill-defined under *global* (super)symmetry breaking inducing infinite norms if they act on any vector in the Hilbert space[2]. Taking these remarks into account, we intend our formulation to be founded on dynamics which is always (super)symmetric, irrespective of broken-unbroken (super)symmetry. We shall start from superderivations in a graded C^*-algebra not from supercharge operators in a (tacitly selected) Hilbert space which may or may not exist. A superderivation defines an infinitesimal supersymmetry transformation without referring to states or representations[3].

Let us summarize some notations given in §2. We consider a unital graded C^*-algebra $\mathcal{F}$ with a (non-trivial) $\mathbb{Z}^2$-periodic automorphism γ. The odd and even parts of the graded C^*-algebra abstractly represent the set of fermionic elements and that of bosonic elements, respectively. A linear map δ in $\mathcal{F}$ satisfying the odd property and the graded Leibniz rule with respect to γ is called a superderivation. Let $\mathcal{A}_\circ$ denote some γ-invariant $*$-subalgebra in $\mathcal{F}$ which will play an important role throughout this paper. If a state on $\mathcal{F}$ is invariant under the superderivation δ (on $\mathcal{A}_\circ$), then it is said to be supersymmetric with respect to δ Definition 2.4.

A general formulation of supersymmetric C^*-dynamical systems is presented in §3. We distinguish two classes which will be referred to as Case (I) and Case (II). For Case (I) we have in mind hidden supersymmetry in fermion lattice systems (or quantum spin lattice systems). In such systems, there is no actual boson[4]. On the other hand, Case (II) is for supersymmetric quantum field theories, although only a special non-interacting model is presently available. Let us review these two cases.

---

[2] The following statement about supersymmetry breaking in infinitely extended systems and the (impossibility of) implementation of supercharges as linear operators is quoted from [14, 1]. *For asymptotically abelian C^*-dynamical systems (typically translation invariant ones), if supersymmetry transformation is implementable in the Hilbert space of the Gelfand-Naimark-Segal (GNS) construction for a state, namely some densely defined closed linear operators Q and Q^* generate infinitesimal supersymmetry transformation in the GNS Hilbert space, then Q and Q^* both inevitably annihilate the cyclic vector, hence supersymmetry is unbroken.*

[3] It is noted in [12] that *supergauge transformations would have to be interpreted as automorphisms under spontaneously symmetry breakdown* (to say nothing of under unbroken symmetry). In this paper, we use superderivations without Grassmann parameters. It seems, however, a natural demand to modify our C^*-algebraic formalism so that it captures notions in superfield formalism, for examples, automorphism groups of the Grassmann parameter and cyclic representations on super Hilbert spaces.

[4] Application of supersymmetry to non-relativistic statistical mechanics was suggested in [15].

For Case (I), the time development (one-parameter group of $*$-automorphisms) is assumed strongly continuous (i.e. pointwise norm continuous) §3.1 as is often the case in fermion (quantum spin) lattice models [5]. In Case (I) we put a very nice condition $\delta(\mathcal{A}_\circ) \subset \mathcal{A}_\circ$ (3.9) that permits the composition of the superderivations on a norm dense $*$-subalgebra $\mathcal{A}_\circ$. Thanks to this condition, it is immediate to obtain infinitesimal supersymmetric relations corresponding to (1.1) (1.2) (1.3) Definition 3.3 for Case (I).

For Case (II), the time development in the C^*-system is not strongly continuous due to the existence of boson fields. Instead we assume that the time development is weakly continuous in the GNS (cyclic) representations induced by the states satisfying some mild conditions which are not necessarily supersymmetric §3.2[5]. According to its original meaning, supersymmetry transforms fermion fields to (unbounded) boson fields and vice versa. It turns out that the above convenient condition (3.9) on the superderivation fails in Case (II). To circumvent such difficulty, [17] has invented a novel method in establishing a C^*-algebraic formulation of supersymmetric quantum field models. Based on this model construction and the mathematical tools developed there, we provide a general definition of supersymmetric C^*-dynamics for Case (II) Definition 3.14.

After §3, we mainly consider the case of unbroken supersymmetry. Supercharges are defined by superderivations as closed linear operators in the GNS Hilbert space for supersymmetric states §4. We then consider supersymmetric relations in the GNS Hilbert space for supersymmetric states §5. Some preliminary results are given in §5.1 for Case (I) and in §5.2 for Case (II). Subsequently in §5.3, the exact formula of the realized supersymmetry algebra is obtained for both Case (I) and Case (II) Theorem 5.11. The key result is the essential self-adjointness of supercharges in the GNS Hilbert space of supersymmetric states[6].

From the self-adjointness of supercharges we derive several consequences in §6 §7. We show that any supersymmetric state is a ground state (whether it be pure or not) Theorem 6.2[7]. We show that the set of supersymmetric states for any given supersymmetric C^*-dynamics is a face of the state space of the C^*-algebra Theorem6.3[8]. The same conclusions as Theorem 6.2 and Theorem 6.3 were already shown under a similar assumption to Case

---

[5] The general status will be described as follows [16, § 4.8]: *For continuous quantum systems, as best one may hope to construct time evolution as a σ-weakly one-parameter group of $*$-automorphisms on the C^*-algebras on an appropriate Hilbert space.*

[6] The self-adjointness of supercharge (or Dirac) operators in a given (super-)Hilbert space has been discussed under several situations e.g. [23, 24, 25, 26, 27], see also the references therein.

[7] Theorem 6.2 agrees with the common knowledge in physics [18]. It implies that supersymmetry is spontaneously broken at any positive temperature. According to some physics literature, such symmetry breaking is due to the different statistics between fermions and bosons, see e.g. [28]. It should be noted that we use the abstract supersymmetry algebra itself, but do not use directly the fermion-boson statistics at any point. In fact, we consider the situation where bosons do not exist, typically fermion lattice models. We also make it clear that the asymptotically abelian assumption on the dynamics is unnecessary for Theorem 6.2. This theorem is obviously valid for systems on finite regions.

[8] It is important to understand the space of degenerate (inequivalent) supersymmetric states (the moduli space of supersymmetric vacua) in supersymmetric (gauge) theories, as it is generally complicated, see e.g. [29]. The C^*-algebraic formalism would hopefully provide some insight into general aspects of these spaces.

(I) in [1, Prop. 2.2]. Our new proofs for these theorems make use of Theorem 5.11, and they are valid for both Case (I) and Case (II)[9]. It is shown that the (self-adjoint) supercharges are affiliated to the von Neumann algebra generated by the GNS representation of any supersymmetric state Theorem 7.1.

In §8 we give examples of supersymmetric C^*-dynamics satisfying all the assumptions set in §2 §3. For Case (I) a general class of finite range supersymmetric fermion lattice models is formulated in §8.1. We show (inequivalent) supersymmetric states for a special example modeled on a model in [15, § 3]. For Case (II) we consider the same supersymmetric C^*-dynamics as that given in [17] (which is a non-interacting quantum field model mentioned before) in §8.2. A supersymmetric state for this model is given as a product state of some Fock states on the fermion system and on the boson system.

Finally in Remark 8.10, we suggest some open problems about superderivations and supersymmetry in C^*-systems that arise naturally from our foregoing discussions.

2 Notation

We introduce the notation and some standing assumptions used throughout this paper. Other assumptions mainly concerned with topology on C^*-dynamics will be specified later in §3.

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a unital C^*-algebra whose unit is denoted 1. Suppose that there is a $*$-automorphism γ on $\mathcal{F}$ such that γ^2 is the identity map, namely a $\mathbb{Z}^2$-group of $*$-automorphisms. Hence $\mathcal{F}$ is decomposed into its even and odd parts as $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}^e \oplus \mathcal{F}^o$, where

$$\mathcal{F}^e := \{F \in \mathcal{F} \mid \gamma(F) = F\}, \quad \mathcal{F}^o := \{F \in \mathcal{F} \mid \gamma(F) = -F\}. \tag{2.1}$$

The graded commutator on $\mathcal{F}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} [F_+,\, G_\pm]_\gamma \;&:=\; [F_+,\, G_\pm] = F_+G_\pm - G_\pm F_+, \;\text{ for }\; F_+ \in \mathcal{F}^e,\; G_+ \in \mathcal{F}^e \;\text{ and }\; G_- \in \mathcal{F}^o, \\ [F_-,\, G_-]_\gamma \;&:=\; \{F_-\; G_-\} = F_-G_- + G_-F_-, \;\text{ for }\; F_- \in \mathcal{F}^o,\; G_- \in \mathcal{F}^o. \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

Let δ be a linear map whose domain $\mathcal{D}_\delta$ is assumed to be a unital γ-invariant $*$-subalgebra of $\mathcal{F}$. If δ is *odd* with respect to the grading:

$$\delta \cdot \gamma = -\gamma \cdot \delta \;\text{ on } \mathcal{D}_\delta, \tag{2.3}$$

and the *graded Leibniz rule* holds:

$$\delta(FG) = \delta(F)G + \gamma(F)\delta(G) \;\text{ for } F, G \in \mathcal{D}_\delta, \tag{2.4}$$

---

[9] One may deduce Theorem 6.2 Theorem 6.3 from some heuristic argument based on VEV which was reviewed in this section. But it seems insufficient as a mathematically solid proof.

then δ is called a superderivation (in $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to γ). We will denote the composition of maps (derivations, superderivations, automorphisms) in $\mathcal{F}$ by the symbol '$\cdot$'. By (2.3)

$$\delta(\mathcal{D}_\delta^e) \subset \mathcal{F}^o, \quad \delta(\mathcal{D}_\delta^o) \subset \mathcal{F}^e,$$

where $\mathcal{D}_\delta^e := \mathcal{D}_\delta \cap \mathcal{F}^e$, $\mathcal{D}_\delta^o := \mathcal{D}_\delta \cap \mathcal{F}^o$. For $1 (\in \mathcal{D}_\delta^e)$, by noting $\delta(1) = \delta(1 \cdot 1) = \delta(1)1 + 1\delta(1) = 2\delta(1)$,

$$\delta(1) = 0. \tag{2.5}$$

The conjugate of δ is defined as

$$\delta^*(F) := -\delta\big(\gamma(F^*)\big)^* \quad \text{for} \quad F \in \mathcal{D}_{\delta^*} := \mathcal{D}_\delta. \tag{2.6}$$

It is immediate to see that δ^* is a superderivation and $\delta^{**} = \delta$. If a superderivation δ_{s} satisfies

$$\delta_{\mathrm{s}} = \delta_{\mathrm{s}}^*, \tag{2.7}$$

then it is said to be *symmetric*. The subscript of δ_{s} will stand for the adjective symmetric. Similarly if a superderivation δ_{as} satisfies

$$\delta_{\mathrm{as}} = -\delta_{\mathrm{as}}^*, \tag{2.8}$$

then it is said to be *anti-symmetric*. For any superderivation δ, let

$$\delta_{\mathrm{s},1} := \delta + \delta^*, \quad \delta_{\mathrm{s},2} := i(\delta - \delta^*) \ \text{ on } \mathcal{D}_{\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}} = \mathcal{D}_{\delta_{\mathrm{s},2}} = \mathcal{D}_\delta. \tag{2.9}$$

These $\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}$ and $\delta_{\mathrm{s},2}$ are symmetric superderivations by definition. Conversely, any superderivation and its conjugate can be written as a linear sum of symmetric ones:

$$\delta = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_{\mathrm{s},1} - i\delta_{\mathrm{s},2}), \quad \delta^* = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_{\mathrm{s},1} + i\delta_{\mathrm{s},2}). \tag{2.10}$$

Remark 2.1. There are some remarks about our (abuse of) notation on superderivations. We denote a general superderivation by δ, and a general symmetric superderivation by δ_{s} as above. In principle, δ can be symmetric and non-symmetric. We note that if δ is symmetric and nilpotent, i.e. $\delta = \delta^*$ and $\delta \cdot \delta = \mathbf{0}$ are both satisfied, then it generates a trivial time-development. By the same reason, the anti-symmetric superderivation satisfying the nilpotent condition leads to such triviality. See Remark 3.4 which is just below Definition 3.3. Therefore under the nilpotent assumption on δ, it is understood that δ is generally neither symmetric nor anti-symmetric. From a given (non-symmetric) δ, two symmetric superderivations $\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}$ and $\delta_{\mathrm{s},2}$ are given as (2.9). To indicate each of $\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}$ and $\delta_{\mathrm{s},2}$, we will sometimes denote simply δ_{s}, when there is no fear of confusion.

By way of illustration, take a bounded superderivation δ_q with $q \in \mathcal{F}^o$

$$\delta_q(F) := [q,\ F]_\gamma \quad \text{for } F \in \mathcal{F}. \tag{2.11}$$

It is immediately see

$$\delta_q^* = \delta_{q^*}, \tag{2.12}$$

and

$$\delta_{q_{\mathrm{s},1}}(F) = [q_{\mathrm{s}1},\ F]_\gamma, \quad \delta_{q_{\mathrm{s},2}}(F) = [q_{\mathrm{s}2},\ F]_\gamma, \tag{2.13}$$

where

$$q_{\mathrm{s}1} := q + q^*, \quad q_{\mathrm{s}2} := i(q - q^*). \tag{2.14}$$

A direct computation yields

$$\delta_{0h} = \delta_q^* \cdot \delta_q + \delta_q \cdot \delta_q^*, \tag{2.15}$$

where δ_{0h} is a bounded derivation defined as

$$\delta_{0h}(F) := [h,\ F] \ \text{ for } F \in \mathcal{F} \text{ with } h := \{q^*,\ q\}. \tag{2.16}$$

If

$$q^2 = 0, \tag{2.17}$$

then

$$\delta_q \cdot \delta_q = \mathbf{0}, \ \ \delta_q^* \cdot \delta_q^* = \mathbf{0}, \tag{2.18}$$

where $\mathbf{0}$ is the zero map on $\mathcal{F}$, and

$$\delta_{0h} = \delta_{q_{\mathrm{s},1}} \cdot \delta_{q_{\mathrm{s},1}} = \delta_{q_{\mathrm{s},2}} \cdot \delta_{q_{\mathrm{s},2}}. \tag{2.19}$$

Let α_t ($t \in \mathbb{R}$) be a one-parameter group of $*$-automorphisms of $\mathcal{F}$ that describes time development. Assume that it preserves the grading:

$$\alpha_t \cdot \gamma = \gamma \cdot \alpha_t. \tag{2.20}$$

Let δ_0 denote the generator of α_t *formally* given as

$$\delta_0 = -i\frac{d}{dt}\alpha_t\Big|_{t=0}. \tag{2.21}$$

The exact meaning of this will be given later in (3.2) for Case (I) and in (3.23) for Case (II). (In Case (I) δ_0 is a derivation in the C^*-algebra, whereas in Case (II) it is not given as such, see Remark 3.11.)

Let $\mathcal{A}_\circ$ be a unital γ-invariant $*$-subalgebra such that

$$\mathcal{A}_\circ \subset \mathcal{D}_\delta (= \mathcal{D}_{\delta^*}). \tag{2.22}$$

We will mainly work with $\mathcal{A}_\circ$ (rather than $\mathcal{D}_\delta$) throughout this paper.

Let ω be a state (a normalized positive linear functional) on $\mathcal{F}$. The Gelfand-Naimark-Segal (GNS) representation for ω is denoted by the GNS triplet $\big(\pi_\omega,\ \mathscr{H}_\omega,\ \Omega_\omega\big)$ which is characterized through

$$\omega(F) = \Big(\Omega_\omega,\ \pi_\omega(F)\Omega_\omega\Big) \ \text{ for every } F \in \mathcal{F}.$$

Here the right-hand side uses the (positive-definite) inner product of the GNS Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}_\omega$ and $\Omega_\omega \in \mathscr{H}_\omega$ is a cyclic vector, see [19, 20] [5]. The von Neumann algebra generated by the representation π_ω of $\mathcal{F}$ on $\mathscr{H}_\omega$ is given as the weak closure of $\pi_\omega(\mathcal{F})$ on $\mathscr{H}_\omega$,

$$\mathfrak{M}_\omega := \pi_\omega(\mathcal{F})'' \subset \mathfrak{B}(\mathscr{H}_\omega).$$

Let

$$\mathscr{H}_{\omega\,\circ} := \pi_\omega(\mathcal{A}_\circ)\Omega_\omega, \tag{2.23}$$

$$\mathscr{H}_{\omega\,\delta} := \pi_\omega(\mathcal{D}_\delta)\Omega_\omega. \tag{2.24}$$

These are $*$-invariant subspaces of $\mathscr{H}_\omega$, and $\mathscr{H}_{\omega\,\circ} \subset \mathscr{H}_{\omega\,\delta}$. (Later we assume that these are dense in $\mathscr{H}_\omega$ as (3.5) for Case (I) and (3.20) for Case (II).)

A state ω is said to be *even*, if it is invariant under the grading γ,

$$\omega\big(\gamma(F)\big) = \omega(F) \ \text{ for every } F \in \mathcal{F}. \tag{2.25}$$

For an even state ω, there exists a grading automorphism $\tilde{\gamma}$ on $\mathfrak{M}_\omega$ such that

$$\tilde{\gamma}\big(\pi_\omega(F)\big) = \pi_\omega\big(\gamma(F)\big) \ \text{for } F \in \mathcal{F}. \tag{2.26}$$

By a self-adjoint unitary Γ on $\mathscr{H}_\omega$, $\tilde{\gamma}$ is implemented as

$$\tilde{\gamma}(X) = \mathrm{Ad}(\Gamma)(X) \ \text{ for } X \in \mathfrak{M}_\omega. \tag{2.27}$$

We choose Γ such that

$$\Gamma\Omega_\omega = \Omega_\omega. \tag{2.28}$$

We endow a graded structure with the von Neumann algebra $\mathfrak{M}_\omega$ in a similar way to (2.1):

$$\mathfrak{M}_\omega = \mathfrak{M}_\omega^e \oplus \mathfrak{M}_\omega^o, \tag{2.29}$$

where

$$\mathfrak{M}_\omega^e := \{X \in \mathfrak{M}_\omega \bigm| \tilde{\gamma}(X) = X\}, \quad \mathfrak{M}_\omega^o := \{X \in \mathfrak{M}_\omega \bigm| \tilde{\gamma}(X) = -X\}. \tag{2.30}$$

Let

$$\mathscr{H}_{\omega\,+} := \{\eta \in \mathscr{H}_\omega \bigm| \Gamma\eta = +\eta\}, \quad \mathscr{H}_{\omega\,-} := \{\eta \in \mathscr{H}_\omega \bigm| \Gamma\eta = -\eta\}. \tag{2.31}$$

Namely $\mathscr{H}_+$ and $\mathscr{H}_-$ are eigenspaces of Γ with the eigenvalues $+1$ and -1, respectively. We decompose $\mathscr{H}_\omega$ into the orthogonal direct sum $\mathscr{H}_\omega = \mathscr{H}_{\omega\,+} \oplus \mathscr{H}_{\omega\,-}$ and write $\xi \in \mathscr{H}_\omega$ as a column vector $\xi = \begin{pmatrix} \xi_+ \\ \xi_- \end{pmatrix}$ with $\xi_+ \in \mathscr{H}_{\omega\,+}$ and $\xi_- \in \mathscr{H}_{\omega\,-}$. Let

$$P_\pm := \frac{1}{2}\left(I \pm \Gamma\right), \tag{2.32}$$

where I is the identity operator on $\mathscr{H}_\omega$. Then $\mathscr{H}_{\omega\,\pm} = P_\pm \mathscr{H}_\omega$, and

$$\Gamma = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & -I \end{pmatrix}, \quad P_+ = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad P_- = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{on } \mathscr{H}_\omega = \mathscr{H}_{\omega\,+} \oplus \mathscr{H}_{\omega\,-}. \tag{2.33}$$

Remark 2.2. According to the univalence super-selection rule [3], the fermion-grading symmetry for the time development (2.20) and for the state (2.25) will never be violated in our world. (We also consider its breaking as mathematically pathological [30].) In our general mathematical formulation, however, γ denotes an arbitrary grading automorphism, and it is not necessarily meant to be the fermion grading counting the half-integer spins. So in this paper, we will not omit the term 'even', whenever it is assumed.

Remark 2.3. By (2.28), ω is a bosonic state. However it is only a matter of convention. It is possible to choose $\Gamma\Omega_\omega = -\Omega_\omega$, namely, ω is fermionic. Such alternative makes no difference, see Remark 5.13.

Our definition of supersymmetric states is given without reference to the time development or its generator as follows.

Definition 2.4. If a state φ on $\mathcal{F}$ is invariant under superderivation δ on $\mathcal{A}_\circ$, namely,

$$\varphi\left(\delta(A)\right) = 0 \ \text{ for every } A \in \mathcal{A}_\circ, \tag{2.34}$$

then it is said to be supersymmetric (with respect to δ on $\mathcal{A}_\circ$).

If φ is supersymmetric in the above sense, then it is also supersymmetric with respect to δ^* on $\mathcal{A}_\circ$ due to (2.6),

$$\varphi\left(\delta^*(A)\right) = 0 \text{ for every } A \in \mathcal{A}_\circ. \tag{2.35}$$

Proposition 2.5. *A state φ is supersymmetric with respect to δ if and only if it is supersymmetric with respect to $\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}$ and $\delta_{\mathrm{s},2}$.*

Proof. By (2.9) (2.10) it is obvious. ☐

Remark 2.6. It seems natural to adopt the whole domain $\mathcal{D}_\delta$ in place of the subalgebra $\mathcal{A}_\circ(\subset \mathcal{D}_\delta)$ for the definition of supersymmetric states. With some additional topological conditions, the invariance under δ can be extended to $\mathcal{D}_\delta$ from $\mathcal{A}_\circ$. This will be shown in Proposition 4.6.

3 Supersymmetric C^*-dynamics

In this section, we formulate C^*-dynamics that encodes supersymmetry and time development in the C^*-algebra. We separately consider Case (I) and Case (II) due to several reasons. Among others, for the former the formulation is completely given within the C^*-algebra, whereas for the latter some additional assumptions on states are needed. The notation and the standing assumptions in §2 remain.

3.1 The case of strongly continuous dynamical systems; Case (I)

We assume that the time automorphism group α_t ($t \in \mathbb{R}$) is strongly continuous (i.e. pointwise norm continuous). Namely for every $F \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$\|\alpha_t(F) - F\| \longrightarrow 0, \text{ as } t \to 0. \tag{3.1}$$

Let δ_0 denote the infinitesimal generator of α_t with its domain $\mathcal{D}_{\delta_0}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{\delta_0} &:= \left\{A \in \mathcal{F}\,;\ \lim_{t\to 0} \frac{1}{t}\left(\alpha_t(A) - A\right) \text{ exists in the } C^*\text{-norm}\right\}, \\ \delta_0(A) &:= -i\frac{d}{dt}\alpha_t(A)\Big|_{t=0} \in \mathcal{F} \ \text{ for } A \in \mathcal{D}_{\delta_0}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

As α_t is a one-parameter group of $*$-automorphisms, $\mathcal{D}_{\delta_0}$ is a unital $*$-subalgebra of $\mathcal{F}$, and δ_0 is a $*$-derivation. Of course, the (usual) Leibniz rule is satisfied:

$$\delta_0(FG) = \delta_0(F)G + F\delta_0(G) \ \text{ for } F, G \in \mathcal{D}_{\delta_0}. \tag{3.3}$$

By (2.20) $\mathcal{D}_{\delta_0}$ is γ-invariant, and

$$\delta_0 \cdot \gamma = \gamma \cdot \delta_0 \ \text{ on } \mathcal{D}_{\delta_0}. \tag{3.4}$$

Recall that δ is a superderivation with its domain $\mathcal{D}_\delta$ and that $\mathcal{A}_\circ$ is a unital γ-invariant $*$-subalgebra included in $\mathcal{D}_\delta$ (2.22). For Case (I), we assume

$$\mathcal{A}_\circ \text{ is norm dense in } \mathcal{F}, \tag{3.5}$$

$$\mathcal{A}_\circ \text{ is a core for the } *\text{-derivation } \delta_0 \text{ in the norm topology}, \tag{3.6}$$

$$\delta|_{\mathcal{A}_\circ} \text{ i.e. the superderivation } \delta \text{ on } \mathcal{A}_\circ \text{ is closable in norm and } \overline{\delta|_{\mathcal{A}_\circ}} \subset \delta, \tag{3.7}$$

$$\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}|_{\mathcal{A}_\circ}\ (\delta_{\mathrm{s},2}|_{\mathcal{A}_\circ}) \text{ is closable in norm and } \overline{\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}|_{\mathcal{A}_\circ}} \subset \delta_{\mathrm{s},1}\ (\overline{\delta_{\mathrm{s},2}|_{\mathcal{A}_\circ}} \subset \delta_{\mathrm{s},2}), \tag{3.8}$$

and

$$\delta(\mathcal{A}_\circ) \subset \mathcal{A}_\circ. \tag{3.9}$$

There are other assumptions not given here. These will be given after we have completed the formulation of supersymmetric dynamics in Definition 3.3 Proposition 3.5 Proposition 3.6.

Remark 3.1. The above (3.9) is in the definition of 'quantum algebra' [21]. This stringent condition for Case (I) will not be assumed for Case (II).

Remark 3.2. For (3.7) one may assume the equality, i.e. $\delta = \overline{\delta|_{\mathcal{A}_\circ}}$, namely $\mathcal{A}_\circ$ is a core for the closed superderivation δ. Similarly for (3.8) one may assume the equalities, too.

By (3.9) (2.6) (2.9),

$$\delta^*(\mathcal{A}_\circ) \subset \mathcal{A}_\circ, \quad \delta_{\mathrm{s},1}(\mathcal{A}_\circ) \subset \mathcal{A}_\circ, \quad \delta_{\mathrm{s},2}(\mathcal{A}_\circ) \subset \mathcal{A}_\circ. \tag{3.10}$$

By (3.9) (3.10) the composition of δ with itself and with its conjugate δ^* are defined on $\mathcal{A}_\circ$. So it is immediate to obtain the supersymmetric relations corresponding to (1.1) (1.2) in §1 in terms of (super)derivations.

Definition 3.3. Suppose that all the assumptions for Case (I) given so far in this §3.1 (in addition to the standing assumptions given in §2) are satisfied. Let δ denote the superderivation (which is neither symmetric nor anti-symmetric unless it induces the trivial time-development). Let δ_0 denote the $*$-derivation of the infinitesimal generator of the strongly continuous time automorphism group α_t ($t \in \mathbb{R}$). The following set of formulae satisfied by δ and δ_0 is referred to as (strong infinitesimal) supersymmetric dynamics (with respect to δ and δ_0):

$$\delta \cdot \delta = \mathbf{0}, \quad \delta^* \cdot \delta^* = \mathbf{0} \text{ on } \mathcal{A}_\circ, \tag{3.11}$$

$$\delta_0 = \delta^* \cdot \delta + \delta \cdot \delta^* \quad \text{on} \quad \mathcal{A}_\circ, \tag{3.12}$$

where $\mathbf{0}$ is the zero map.

Obviously, the former equality in (3.11) is equivalent to the latter in it. From (3.9) (3.10) (3.12),

$$\delta_0(\mathcal{A}_\circ) \subset \mathcal{A}_\circ. \tag{3.13}$$

Remark 3.4. In Definition 3.3 it is appropriate to assume that δ is neither symmetric nor anti-symmetric, because if $\delta = \delta^*$ or $\delta = -\delta^*$, then δ_0 becomes $\mathbf{0}$ by (3.11) (3.12).

The next formula corresponds to (1.3) in §1.

Proposition 3.5. *Assume the same setting as Definition* 3.3*. Then*

$$\delta \cdot \delta_0 = \delta_0 \cdot \delta, \quad \delta^* \cdot \delta_0 = \delta_0 \cdot \delta^* \quad \textit{on} \quad \mathcal{A}_\circ. \tag{3.14}$$

Proof. These follow from (3.9) (3.10) (3.11) (3.12) (3.13). □

We can equivalently rewrite Definition 3.3 in terms of symmetric superderivations.

Proposition 3.6. *Assume the same setting as Definition* 3.3*. Let* $\delta_{\mathrm{s},1} = \delta + \delta^*$ *and* $\delta_{\mathrm{s},2} = i(\delta - \delta^*)$ *as* (2.9)*. The following set of formulae*

$$\delta_{\mathrm{s},1} \cdot \delta_{\mathrm{s},2} = -\delta_{\mathrm{s},2} \cdot \delta_{\mathrm{s},1} \quad \textit{on} \quad \mathcal{A}_\circ, \tag{3.15}$$

$$\delta_0 = \delta_{\mathrm{s},1}^2 (= \delta_{\mathrm{s},1} \cdot \delta_{\mathrm{s},1}) = \delta_{\mathrm{s},2}^2 (= \delta_{\mathrm{s},2} \cdot \delta_{\mathrm{s},2}) \quad \textit{on} \quad \mathcal{A}_\circ \tag{3.16}$$

is equivalent to (3.11) (3.12) *in Definition* 3.3*, i.e. the strong infinitesimal supersymmetric dynamics.*

Proof. Assuming (3.11) (3.12), we have

$$\delta_{\mathrm{s},1} \cdot \delta_{\mathrm{s},1} = (\delta^* \cdot \delta + \delta \cdot \delta^*) + \delta \cdot \delta + \delta^* \cdot \delta^* = \delta_0 + \mathbf{0} + \mathbf{0} = \delta_0,$$

similarly

$$\delta_{\mathrm{s},2} \cdot \delta_{\mathrm{s},2} = \delta_0.$$

Also

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\mathrm{s},1} \cdot \delta_{\mathrm{s},2} &= i(\delta \cdot \delta - \delta^* \cdot \delta^*) + i(\delta^* \cdot \delta - \delta \cdot \delta^*) \\ &= i(\delta^* \cdot \delta - \delta \cdot \delta^*), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{\mathrm{s},2}\cdot\delta_{\mathrm{s},1} &= i(\delta\cdot\delta-\delta^{*}\cdot\delta^{*})-i(\delta^{*}\cdot\delta-\delta\cdot\delta^{*})\\ &= -i(\delta^{*}\cdot\delta-\delta\cdot\delta^{*}),\end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}\cdot\delta_{\mathrm{s},2}=-\delta_{\mathrm{s},2}\cdot\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}.$$

Conversely, assume (3.15) (3.16). By (2.10) we have

$$\delta\cdot\delta \;=\; \frac{1}{4}(\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}\cdot\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}-\delta_{\mathrm{s},2}\cdot\delta_{\mathrm{s},2})-\frac{i}{4}(\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}\cdot\delta_{\mathrm{s},2}+\delta_{\mathrm{s},2}\cdot\delta_{\mathrm{s},1})=\frac{1}{4}(\delta_0-\delta_0)+\mathbf{0}=\mathbf{0},$$

and similarly

$$\delta^{*}\cdot\delta^{*} \;=\; \mathbf{0}.$$

We have

$$\delta^{*}\cdot\delta+\delta\cdot\delta^{*}=\frac{1}{4}(\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}\cdot\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}+\delta_{\mathrm{s},2}\cdot\delta_{\mathrm{s},2})\cdot 2=\frac{1}{2}(\delta_0+\delta_0)=\delta_0.$$

□

We are in a position to provide the remaining assumptions which have been so far unstated. Assume that the infinitesimal formula (3.14) can be integrated as

$$\alpha_t(\mathcal{A}_\circ)\subset\mathcal{D}_\delta,\quad \delta\cdot\alpha_t=\alpha_t\cdot\delta,\quad \delta^{*}\cdot\alpha_t=\alpha_t\cdot\delta^{*}\quad\text{on}\;\;\mathcal{A}_\circ\;\;\text{for each } t\in\mathbb{R}. \tag{3.17}$$

By (3.17) combined with (2.9)

$$\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}\cdot\alpha_t=\alpha_t\cdot\delta_{\mathrm{s},1},\quad \delta_{\mathrm{s},2}\cdot\alpha_t=\alpha_t\cdot\delta_{\mathrm{s},2}\;\;\text{on}\;\;\mathcal{A}_\circ\;\;\text{for each } t\in\mathbb{R}. \tag{3.18}$$

We need to add the following more specific assumption upon $\alpha_t(\mathcal{A}_\circ)\subset\mathcal{D}_\delta$ in (3.17):

$$\text{For each } t\in\mathbb{R},\; \alpha_t(\mathcal{A}_\circ) \text{ is included in the domain of } \overline{\delta|_{\mathcal{A}_\circ}} \text{ and of } \overline{\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}|_{\mathcal{A}_\circ}},\; \overline{\delta_{\mathrm{s},2}|_{\mathcal{A}_\circ}}. \tag{3.19}$$

These (3.17) (3.18) (3.19) will be essential in the proof of self-adjointness of supercharges §5.3 for Case (I) (through Lemma 5.4 in §5.1).

Remark 3.7. If δ_0 is *bounded*, then (3.17) immediately follows from (3.14) by integration [31]. However, (3.17) is *assumed* for Case (I). In the concrete example of Case (I) (general supersymmetric fermion lattice models of finite range interactions) given in §8.1, (3.17) is derived from (3.14) together with other (some special) assumptions, see Proposition 8.9 for details.

Remark 3.8. Let $\mathcal{F}^{\alpha}(-k,k)$ denote the spectral subspace for an open subset $(-k,k)\subset\mathbb{R}$ with respect to the one-parameter group of $*$-automorphisms α_t [5]. Let $\mathcal{F}^{\alpha}_0 := \bigcup_{k>0}\mathcal{F}^{\alpha}(-k,k)$. Then it is by definition invariant under α_t. Suppose that α_t is even

(2.20). Let δ_{s} be a symmetric superderivation in $\mathcal{F}$. It was shown [31] that if $\delta_{\mathrm{s}}\cdot\alpha_t \supset \alpha_t\cdot\delta_{\mathrm{s}}$, $\delta_{\mathrm{s}}^2 \subset \delta_0$, and the domain $\mathcal{D}_{\delta_{\mathrm{s}}^2}$ of δ_{s}^2 is norm dense in $\mathcal{F}$, then (3.9), a crucial assumption in Case (I), holds on $\mathcal{D}_{\delta_{\mathrm{s}}^2} \cap \mathcal{F}_0^{\alpha}$. It was also show there that $\mathcal{D}_{\delta_{\mathrm{s}}^2} \cap \mathcal{F}_0^{\alpha}$ is norm dense in $\mathcal{F}$. We, however, do not take $\mathcal{D}_{\delta_{\mathrm{s}}^2} \cap \mathcal{F}_0^{\alpha}$ as our $\mathcal{A}_\circ$, see the next remark why it is.

Remark 3.9. The invariance of $\mathcal{A}_\circ$ under α_t is not assumed for Case (I), whereas it will be assumed for Case (II) in (3.24) in the next subsection §3.2. Actually the examples of Case (I) given in §8.1 do generally violate the α_t-invariance of $\mathcal{A}_\circ$. It may be deserved to note that by excluding this condition, it is possible to keep out of a statement which implies the boundedness of superderivations [31, Th.3].

Remark 3.10. In the concrete example of Case (I) given in §8.1, (3.7) (3.8) and (3.17) (3.18) (3.19) are verified under the assumption of unbroken supersymmetry. See Proposition 8.7 Proposition 8.9 and Remark 8.8.

3.2 The case of weakly continuous dynamical systems; Case (II)

In Case (II), we basically consider the situation where boson and fermion fields are present, although our abstract formulation is not restricted to such usual setting. Since boson fields (satisfying the canonical commutation relations (CCR)) are unbounded, they are not in the C^*-algebra as they are. Following the usual recipe, it seems natural to adopt the Weyl C^*-algebra which is generated by the set of unitaries satisfying the Weyl relations as the boson system. Things are not so simple, however, as the following no-go result [17, Prop.3.1] tells us: It is impossible to formulate superderivations that transform fermion fields to the corresponding boson fields and vice versa properly *within* the tensor-product of the Weyl C^*-algebra and the fermion algebra (by using the idea of 'mollifier' that will be explained below). Furthermore the nice condition (3.9) assumed for Case (I) is no longer valid in Case (II). Hence to make sense of supersymmetric relations in C^*-algebra in Case (II) some elaboration is required.

We introduce a general class of supersymmetric C^*-dynamics by distilling some essence from the example given in [17]. We will review this model construction in §8.2. In Case (II) we deal with symmetric superderivations denoted as δ_{s} in order to refer directly to [17] and to make the argument simpler. Such restriction, however, does not spoil the generality, since for any given non-symmetric (nilpotent) superderivation δ, one can apply each of $\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}$ and $\delta_{\mathrm{s},2}$ given as the linear sums of δ and δ^* (2.9) to δ_{s} in any statement that we will show, see Remark 5.14 in §5.

Let ω be a state on $\mathcal{F}$. We note that ω is not necessarily supersymmetric. As before, $\big(\pi_\omega,\ \mathscr{H}_\omega,\ \Omega_\omega\big)$ denotes the GNS triplet for ω, and $\mathfrak{M}_\omega(\subset \mathfrak{B}(\mathscr{H}_\omega))$ denotes the von Neumann algebra generated by the GNS representation. Upon ω and $\mathcal{A}_\circ$ (a γ-invariant $*$-subalgebra included in $\mathcal{D}_\delta$) we assume

$$\pi_\omega(\mathcal{A}_\circ) \text{ is strongly operator dense in } \mathfrak{M}_\omega. \tag{3.20}$$

For the time development, it is assumed that via the GNS representation of ω, α_t induces a σ-weakly continuous one-parameter group of $*$-automorphisms $\tilde{\alpha}_t$ of $\mathfrak{M}_\omega$ such that

$$\pi_\omega\big(\alpha_t(F)\big) = \tilde{\alpha}_t\big(\pi_\omega(F)\big) = U(t)\pi_\omega(F)U(t)^{-1},\ U(t) = e^{itH} \text{ for every } \ t \in \mathbb{R},\ F \in \mathcal{F} \tag{3.21}$$

Here H is some self-adjoint operator on $\mathscr{H}_\omega$, and $U(t)$ $(t \in \mathbb{R})$ is the (strongly continuous) unitary group on $\mathscr{H}_\omega$ generated by H. Namely, the C^*-dynamical system $\{\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{R}, \alpha_t\}$ induces a covariant representation [5, §2.7]. By (3.21) $\tilde{\alpha}_t$ is pointwise continuous in $t(\in \mathbb{R})$ with respect to the strong operator topology as well. The unitary group $\{U(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is assumed to be smooth (strongly differentiable) in t on $\mathscr{H}_{\omega\,\circ}$:

$$\frac{d}{dt}U(t)\xi\Big|_{t=0} = iH\xi \ \text{ for any } \xi \in \mathscr{H}_{\omega\,\circ}. \tag{3.22}$$

From (3.21) (3.22), we have for any $A \in \mathcal{A}_\circ$ and $\eta \in \mathscr{H}_{\omega\,\circ}$

$$\lim_{t\to 0} \frac{1}{t}\Big\{\pi_\omega\big(\alpha_t(A)\big)\eta - \pi_\omega\big(A\big)\eta\Big\} = iH\pi_\omega\big(A\big)\eta - i\pi_\omega\big(A\big)H\eta, \tag{3.23}$$

since $\eta = \pi_\omega(B)\Omega_\omega \in \mathscr{H}_{\omega\,\circ}$ for some $B \in \mathcal{A}_\circ$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{t}\Big\{\pi_\omega\big(\alpha_t(A)\big)\pi_\omega(B)\Omega_\omega - \pi_\omega\big(A\big)\pi_\omega(B)\Omega_\omega\Big\} = \frac{1}{t}\Big\{e^{itH}\pi_\omega(A)e^{-itH}\pi_\omega(B)\Omega_\omega - \pi_\omega(A)\pi_\omega(B)\Omega_\omega\Big\} \\ = \ &\frac{1}{t}\Big\{e^{itH}\pi_\omega(A)\big(e^{-itH}\pi_\omega(B) - \pi_\omega(B)\big)\Omega_\omega\Big\} + \frac{1}{t}\Big\{\big(e^{itH} - I\big)\pi_\omega(AB)\Omega_\omega\Big\}, \end{aligned}$$

which converges in norm to

$$-i\pi_\omega(A)H\pi_\omega(B)\Omega_\omega + iH\pi_\omega(A)\pi_\omega(B)\Omega_\omega$$

as $t \to 0$ by (3.22) and the uniform boundedness $\|e^{itH}\pi_\omega(A)\| \leq \|A\|$. We make the following assumption:

$$\alpha_t(\mathcal{A}_\circ) \subset \mathcal{A}_\circ \text{ for each } t \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{3.24}$$

Remark 3.11. *Formally* (3.23) is expressed as

$$-i\frac{d}{dt}\pi_\omega\big(\alpha_t(A)\big)\Big|_{t=0} = \pi_\omega\big(\delta_0(A)\big) \text{ on } \mathscr{H}_{\omega\,\circ}.$$

The above $\delta_0(A)$ to indicate the time generator (2.21) is not an element of the C^*-algebra $\mathcal{F}$, see [17, §4].

Remark 3.12. As noted previously in Remark 3.9, we do not assume (3.24) for Case (I). So it is not correct that Case (I) (with stronger continuity) implies Case (II) (with weaker continuity). In fact, in the proof of the self-adjointness of supercharges in §5, the argument for Case (II) is simpler thanks to (3.24) than that for Case (I) without this.

Let δ_{s} be a symmetric superderivation with its domain $\mathcal{D}_{\delta_{\mathrm{s}}}$. To provide the supersymmetry algebra in terms of superderivations, we need to make sense of '$\delta_{\mathrm{s}}^2(A)$' which actually does not exist as an element of $\mathcal{F}$. We assume that for each $A \in \mathcal{A}_\circ(\subset \mathcal{D}_\delta)$, there exists a net $\{M_{A,\lambda} \in \mathcal{A}_\circ \cap \mathcal{F}^e\}$[10] with the index $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$ (the positive real numbers) such that

$$M_{A,\lambda}\delta_{\rm s}(A) \in \mathcal{A}_\circ. \tag{3.25}$$

We further assume the following convergence conditions:

$$\pi_\omega(M_{A,\lambda}) \longrightarrow I \quad \text{in the strong operator topology of } \mathfrak{B}(\mathscr{H}_\omega) \ \text{ as } \ \lambda \to \infty, \tag{3.26}$$

and

$$\pi_\omega\bigl(\delta_{\rm s}(M_{A,\lambda})\bigr) \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{in the strong operator topology of } \ \mathfrak{B}(\mathscr{H}_\omega) \ \text{ as } \ \lambda \to \infty, \tag{3.27}$$

where I and 0 are the identity operator and the zero operator on $\mathscr{H}_\omega$. By (3.25) and (2.22), $\delta_{\rm s}\left(M_{A,\lambda}\delta_{\rm s}(A)\right) \in \mathcal{F}$. By using the same notation in [17, Def.4.3] let

$$M_{A,\lambda}\delta_{\rm s}^2(A) := \delta_{\rm s}\left(M_{A,\lambda}\delta_{\rm s}(A)\right) - \delta_{\rm s}(M_{A,\lambda})\delta_{\rm s}(A) \in \mathcal{F}. \tag{3.28}$$

Remark that $M_{A,\lambda}\delta_{\rm s}^2(A)$ does not mean the product of $M_{A,\lambda}$ and $\delta_{\rm s}^2(A)$ which is undefined. For $A \in \mathcal{A}_\circ$, by using its mollifiers $\{M_{A,\lambda} \in \mathcal{A}_\circ \cap \mathcal{F}^e\}$, the singular object '$\delta_{\rm s}^2(A)$' can be approximated (in the GNS representation of ω) by well-defined elements in $\mathcal{F}$. Roughly speaking, this may be comparable to the fact that the delta function is out of a smooth function space, however, it is approximated by smooth functions.

Remark 3.13. In the concrete model analysis that will be summarized in §8.2, we will introduce the *regularity* of ω in the sense of [17, Def.3.5] in (8.71). This notion depends on the special C^*-algebra i.e. the resolvent algebra considered there. By using the regularity of the state, some assumptions given so far in this subsection can be guaranteed. See [17] for details.

The next definition is essentially from [17, Th.5.8 (iii)]. This will express *normality* of a state ω with respect to the underlying supersymmetry to ensure that the *dynamics* realized in ω (through its GNS representation) does not lose the intrinsic supersymmetry encoded implicitly in the C^*-algebra. We assume that it is always satisfied in Case (II).

Definition 3.14. Suppose that all the assumptions for Case (II) given in this §3.2 (in addition to the standing assumptions given in §2) are satisfied. Let $\delta_{\rm s}$ denote the symmetric superderivation, let α_t denote the one-parameter group of $*$-automorphisms. Let ω be a state on $\mathcal{F}$. Let $\bigl(\pi_\omega,\ \mathscr{H}_\omega,\ \Omega_\omega\bigr)$ denote the GNS representation for ω, let $\mathscr{H}_{\omega\,\circ}$ denote the dense subspace of $\mathscr{H}_\omega$ defined as (2.23). If

$$-i\frac{d}{dt}\pi_\omega\bigl(M_{A,\lambda}\alpha_t(A)\bigr)\eta\Big|_{t=0} = \pi_\omega\bigl(M_{A,\lambda}\delta_{\rm s}^2(A)\bigr)\eta \ \text{ for every } \ A \in \mathcal{A}_\circ \text{ and } \ \eta \in \mathscr{H}_{\omega\,\circ}, \tag{3.29}$$

where the derivation in the left-hand side is with respect to the norm of $\mathscr{H}_\omega$, then it is said that ω admits (weak infinitesimal) supersymmetric dynamics (with respect to δ_{s} and α_t).

---

[10] Following [17] $M_{A,\lambda}$ can be taken from the even part.

Remark 3.15. In Definition 3.14 the state ω is not necessarily supersymmetric. Thus (3.29) is a weaker condition than the implementation of the supersymmetry algebra in the GNS Hilbert space for supersymmetric states given as Proposition 4.1. (For example, consider the same supersymmetric C^*-dynamics as that in §8.2. Instead of the supersymmetric vacuum state φ given as (8.97), take the temperature state $\varphi_\beta = \varphi_{\mathrm{fer}\,\beta} \otimes \varphi_{\mathrm{bos}\,\beta}$ at the inverse temperature β for the same quasi-free time automorphism group, where $\varphi_{\mathrm{fer}\,\beta}$ and $\varphi_{\mathrm{bos}\,\beta}$ are the corresponding (quasi-free) equilibrium states at β on the fermion system and on the boson system, respectively. (Note that the above φ_β is not the graded KMS functional given in [17].) As any temperature state breaks supersymmetry, φ_β does. Nevertheless, (3.29) is still valid for $\omega = \varphi_\beta$.

Remark 3.16. The original formula of (3.29) given in [17, Th.5.8 (iii)] is

$$-i\frac{d}{dt}\omega\big(CM_{A,\lambda}\alpha_t(A)B\big)\Big|_{t=0} = \omega\big(CM_{A,\lambda}\delta_{\mathrm{s}}^2(A)B\big), \tag{3.30}$$

for every $A, B, C \in \mathcal{A}_\circ$. Under (3.23) which is presently assumed to hold, (3.30) is equivalent to (3.29).

Remark 3.17. As the term 'strong-weak' anticipates, it is easy to see that Definition 3.3 (or Proposition 3.6) implies Definition 3.14 by taking simply $M_{A,\lambda} = 1$ for all A and λ.

4 Supercharge operators for supersymmetric states

From this section to the end of this paper, we focus on the case where supersymmetry is unbroken. We denote a supersymmetric state by φ. (So far, we have used ω to denote a general state which is not necessarily supersymmetric.) We treat Case (I) and Case (II) simultaneously in *this* section, since among the assumptions in §3 the dense property of $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ} = \pi_\varphi(\mathcal{A}_\circ)\Omega_\varphi$ in the GNS Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}_\varphi$ is only used and no difference arises.

For a supersymmetric state φ, supercharge operators are defined in terms of the superderivations in the GNS Hilbert space as follows.

Proposition 4.1 ([1]). *Assume that φ is a supersymmetric state on $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to the superderivation δ (in the sense of Definition 2.4). Let $\big(\pi_\varphi,\ \mathscr{H}_\varphi,\ \Omega_\varphi\big)$ denote the GNS representation of φ. On the dense subspace $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ} = \pi_\varphi(\mathcal{A}_\circ)\Omega_\varphi$ (2.23) of the GNS Hilbert space, let*

$$Q\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi := \pi_\varphi\big(\delta(A)\big)\Omega_\varphi, \quad A \in \mathcal{A}_\circ. \tag{4.1}$$

Then it defines a closable linear operator satisfying

$$Q\Omega_\varphi = 0, \tag{4.2}$$

and

$$Q^*\Omega_\varphi = 0, \tag{4.3}$$

where Q^* is the adjoint of Q. The following operator equalities hold for $A \in \mathcal{A}_\circ$

$$\pi_\varphi\big(\delta(A)\big) = Q\pi_\varphi(A) - \pi_\varphi\big(\gamma(A)\big)Q \quad \textit{on } \mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ}, \tag{4.4}$$

$$\pi_\varphi\big(\delta^*(A)\big) = Q^*\pi_\varphi(A) - \pi_\varphi\big(\gamma(A)\big)Q^* \quad \textit{on } \mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ}. \tag{4.5}$$

Proof. The statement has been given in [1, Lem.2.1], though, we provide its proof for completeness. For $B_+ \in \mathcal{A}_\circ^e$, $B_- \in \mathcal{A}_\circ^o$, and $A \in \mathcal{A}_\circ$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\big(\pi_\varphi(B_\pm)\Omega_\varphi,\ \pi_\varphi\big(\delta(A)\big)\Omega_\varphi\big) &= \varphi\big(B_\pm^*\delta(A)\big) \\
&= \varphi\big(\pm\delta(B_\pm^* A) \mp \delta(B_\pm^*)A\big) \\
&= \varphi\big(\mp\delta(B_\pm^*)A\big) \\
&= \big(\pi_\varphi\big(\mp\delta(B_\pm^*)\big)^*\Omega_\varphi,\ \pi(A)\Omega_\varphi\big) \\
&= \big(\pi_\varphi\big(\delta^*(B_\pm)\big)\Omega_\varphi,\ \pi(A)\Omega_\varphi\big),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

where in the second equality the graded Leibniz rule, in the third $\varphi\circ\delta = 0$, and in the last equality (2.6) are used. It follows from (4.6) and the dense property of $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ}$ in $\mathscr{H}_\varphi$ that if $\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi = 0$, then $\pi_\varphi\big(\delta(A)\big)\Omega_\varphi = 0$. Hence Q is well-defined on $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ}$. As δ is linear, Q is linear as well. Due to (4.6), the adjoint of Q is given on $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ}$ by

$$Q^*\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi = \pi_\varphi\big(\delta^*(A)\big)\Omega_\varphi,\ A \in \mathcal{A}_\circ. \tag{4.7}$$

Hence the domain $\mathrm{Dom}(Q^*)$ includes $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ}$ which is dense in $\mathscr{H}_\varphi$. By this Q is closable [33, VIII.1].

By (2.5) $Q\Omega_\varphi = Q\pi_\varphi(1)\Omega_\varphi = \pi_\varphi\big(\delta(1)\big)\Omega_\varphi = 0$. Thus (4.2) holds. Since φ is invariant under δ^* (2.35), we have (4.3) in the same way.

For $A, B \in \mathcal{A}_\circ$, by noting (4.1) and $AB \in \mathcal{A}_\circ$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big(Q\pi_\varphi(A) - \pi_\varphi\big(\gamma(A)\big)Q\Big)\pi_\varphi(B)\Omega_\varphi &= \pi_\varphi(\delta(AB))\Omega_\varphi - \pi_\varphi(\gamma(A))\pi_\varphi(\delta(B))\Omega_\varphi \\
&= \pi_\varphi\Big(\delta(A)B + \gamma(A)\delta(B) - \gamma(A)\delta(B)\Big)\Omega_\varphi \\
&= \pi_\varphi(\delta(A))\pi_\varphi(B)\Omega_\varphi.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

Hence (4.4) is shown. By (4.7), (4.5) is shown similarly. □

Remark 4.2. The above (4.2) (4.3) *derived* from unbroken supersymmetry of a state correspond to (1.5). That is to say, Proposition 4.1 has founded the well-known, but a bit heuristic statement in physics that supersymmetry is unbroken if and *only if* the vacuum vector is annihilated by the supercharges [18].

Proposition 4.3. *Let δ_{s} be a symmetric superderivation. Suppose that φ is a supersymmetric state on $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to δ_{s}. Let Q_{s} denote the linear operator implementing δ_{s} in the GNS Hilbert space for φ. Then Q_{s} (defined on $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ}$) is a symmetric operator.*

Proof. By (4.1) (4.7), Q_{s} implements δ_{s}, while Q_{s}^{*} implements δ_{s}^{*}. As $\delta_{\mathrm{s}} = \delta_{\mathrm{s}}^{*}$, we have $Q_{\mathrm{s}} = Q_{\mathrm{s}}^{*}$ on $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ}$. $\square$

By Proposition 4.1, we can define the closure $\overline{Q} := Q^{**}$ of Q. The next Propositions 4.4 4.5 4.6 are about the extension of Q on $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ}$ to $\overline{Q}$ related to the extension of $\delta|_{\mathcal{A}_\circ}$ to δ on $\mathcal{D}_\delta$.

Proposition 4.4. *Let φ be a supersymmetric state on $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to the superderivation δ. Let $\overline{Q}$ denote the closure of the densely defined linear operator Q on $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ}$ implementing δ in the GNS representation $\big(\pi_\varphi,\ \mathscr{H}_\varphi,\ \Omega_\varphi\big)$ for φ. If $A \in \mathcal{D}_\delta$ has a sequence $\{A_n \in \mathcal{A}_\circ\}$ such that $A_n \longrightarrow A$ and $\delta(A_n) \longrightarrow \delta(A)$ in the norm of $\mathcal{F}$, or $\pi_\varphi(A_n) \longrightarrow \pi_\varphi(A)$ and $\pi_\varphi\big(\delta(A_n)\big) \longrightarrow \pi_\varphi\big(\delta(A)\big)$ in the strong operator topology of $\mathfrak{B}(\mathscr{H}_\varphi)$ as $n \to \infty$, then*

$$\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi \in \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{Q}), \quad \overline{Q}\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi = \pi_\varphi\big(\delta(A)\big)\Omega_\varphi. \tag{4.9}$$

Proof. By the assumption,

$$\pi_\varphi(A_n)\Omega_\varphi \longrightarrow \pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi \ \text{ in } \mathscr{H}_\varphi, \text{ and } \pi_\varphi\big(\delta(A_n)\big)\Omega_\varphi \longrightarrow \pi_\varphi\big(\delta(A)\big)\Omega_\varphi \ \text{ in } \mathscr{H}_\varphi, \tag{4.10}$$

as $n \to \infty$. By (4.1),

$$Q\pi_\varphi(A_n)\Omega_\varphi = \pi_\varphi\big(\delta(A_n)\big)\Omega_\varphi. \tag{4.11}$$

By (4.10) (4.11) with the closedness of $\overline{Q}$ we obtain (4.9). $\square$

Proposition 4.5. *Let φ be a supersymmetric state on $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to the superderivation δ. Let $\overline{Q}$ denote the closure of the densely defined linear operator Q implementing δ in the GNS representation $\big(\pi_\varphi,\ \mathscr{H}_\varphi,\ \Omega_\varphi\big)$ for φ. Suppose that $\mathcal{A}_\circ$ is a core*[11] *for δ in the norm of $\mathcal{F}$ or in the strong operator topology of $\mathfrak{B}(\mathscr{H}_\varphi)$ via π_φ, namely for every element in $\mathcal{D}_\delta$, there exists a sequence in $\mathcal{A}_\circ$ satisfying the same convergence condition as in Proposition* 4.4. Then for each $A \in \mathcal{D}_\delta$,

$$\pi_\varphi(A)\mathrm{Dom}(\overline{Q}) \subset \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{Q}), \tag{4.12}$$

and

$$\pi_\varphi\big(\delta(A)\big) = \overline{Q}\pi_\varphi(A) - \pi_\varphi\big(\gamma(A)\big)\overline{Q} \ \text{ on } \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{Q}). \tag{4.13}$$

---

[11] The notion of cores is usually for closed linear operators (maps), but δ (defined on $\mathcal{D}_\delta$) in Propositions 4.5 4.6 is not necessarily closed, see [22].

Proof. Take $\eta \in \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{Q})$. As $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ}$ is a core for $\overline{Q}$ (by definition), there is a sequence $\{\eta_n\}$ in $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ}$ such that

$$\eta_n \longrightarrow \eta, \quad \overline{Q}\eta_n \longrightarrow \overline{Q}\eta, \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty.$$

Hence for any $A \in \mathcal{D}_\delta$,

$$\pi_\varphi(A)\eta_n \longrightarrow \pi_\varphi(A)\eta, \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty.$$

As $\eta_n \in \mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ}$, $\eta_n = \pi_\varphi(B_n)\Omega_\varphi$ with some $B_n \in \mathcal{A}_\circ$.

By the assumption (4.9) is valid for any element of $\mathcal{D}_\delta$. Hence by applying this to $AB_n \in \mathcal{D}_\delta$, we have $\pi_\varphi(AB_n)\Omega_\varphi = \pi_\varphi(A)\eta_n \in \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{Q})$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{Q}\pi_\varphi(A)\eta_n &= \overline{Q}\pi_\varphi(AB_n)\Omega_\varphi \\
&= \pi_\varphi\big(\delta(AB_n)\big)\Omega_\varphi \\
&= \pi_\varphi\big(\delta(A)B_n + \gamma(A)\delta(B_n)\big)\Omega_\varphi = \pi_\varphi\big(\delta(A)\big)\pi_\varphi(B_n)\Omega_\varphi + \pi_\varphi\big(\gamma(A)\big)\overline{Q}\pi_\varphi(B_n)\Omega_\varphi \\
&= \pi_\varphi\big(\delta(A)\big)\eta_n + \pi_\varphi\big(\gamma(A)\big)\overline{Q}\eta_n.
\end{aligned}$$

The right-hand side converges to $\pi_\varphi\big(\delta(A)\big)\eta + \pi_\varphi\big(\gamma(A)\big)\overline{Q}\eta$ as $n \to \infty$. As $\overline{Q}$ is closed, it follows that $\pi_\varphi(A)\eta = \lim_n \pi_\varphi(A)\eta_n \in \mathrm{Dom}(\overline{Q})$ and $\overline{Q}\pi_\varphi(A)\eta = \pi_\varphi\big(\delta(A)\big)\eta + \pi_\varphi\big(\gamma(A)\big)\overline{Q}\eta$. Now (4.12) and (4.13) are proved. □

The next one is about the definition of supersymmetric states. It is not used in this paper.

Proposition 4.6. *Suppose that φ is a supersymmetric state on $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to the superderivation δ in the sense of Definition* 2.4, *namely φ is invariant under δ on $\mathcal{A}_\circ$. Let $\big(\pi_\varphi,\ \mathscr{H}_\varphi,\ \Omega_\varphi\big)$ denote the GNS representation of φ. Then if $\mathcal{A}_\circ$ is a core for δ in the norm of $\mathcal{F}$ or in the strong operator topology of $\mathfrak{B}(\mathscr{H}_\varphi)$ via the GNS representation π_φ, then the δ-invariance of φ is extended to $\mathcal{D}_\delta$, namely,*

$$\varphi\left(\delta(A)\right) = 0 \textit{ for every } A \in \mathcal{D}_\delta. \tag{4.14}$$

Proof. For each $A \in \mathcal{D}_\delta$, there exists $\{A_n \in \mathcal{A}_\circ\}$ satisfying (4.10) by the assumption. From $\varphi\big(\delta(A_n)\big) = \Big(\Omega_\varphi,\ \pi_\varphi\big(\delta(A_n)\big)\Omega_\varphi\Big) = 0$ for each n, $\varphi\big(\delta(A)\big) = \Big(\Omega_\varphi,\ \pi_\varphi\big(\delta(A)\big)\Omega_\varphi\Big) = \lim_n \Big(\Omega_\varphi,\ \pi_\varphi\big(\delta(A_n)\big)\Omega_\varphi\Big) = 0$ follows. □

Remark 4.7. The assumption of Proposition 4.6 is satisfied by the example of Case (I) (supersymmetric fermion lattice models of finite range interactions) in §8.1 as (8.56).

For the remainder of this paper, we always consider the closed extensions of Q and Q_{s} (which were originally defined on the dense subspace $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ}$). We will denote them simply by Q and Q_{s}. When necessary, we will explicitly indicate the domains, as $Q|_{\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ}}$ or Q on $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ}$ etc. Note that Q_{s} is symmetric as it is the closure of the symmetric operator Proposition 4.3.

5 Representation of the supersymmetry algebra under unbroken supersymmetry

We have defined supercharges in the GNS Hilbert space for supersymmetric states in §4. In this section we shall see how the supersymmetry algebra is implemented as operator forms in the GNS Hilbert space by providing detailed analysis of the supercharge operators. In §5.1 and §5.2, several preliminary results are shown respectively for Case (I) and for Case (II). In §5.3 the self-adjointness of supercharges and the *exact* operator formulae of the supersymmetry algebra are established for both Case (I) and Case (II).

5.1 Preliminaries for Case (I)

In this subsection, the assumptions on C^*-dynamics given in §3.1 are all satisfied. It is fairly straightforward to see how the supersymmetric C^*-dynamics for Case (I) (as in Definition 3.3 and Proposition 3.6) is realized on the dense subspace $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ} = \pi_\varphi(\mathcal{A}_\circ)\Omega_\varphi$ in the GNS Hilbert space for a supersymmetric state φ. This will be done in Proposition 5.2 after showing the time-invariance of supersymmetric states.

Lemma 5.1. *Assume the supersymmetric C^*-dynamics for Case* (I) *given in* §3.1*. Let α_t ($t \in \mathbb{R}$) denote the strongly continuous one-parameter group of $*$-automorphisms of $\mathcal{F}$ and let δ_0 denote its generator. Suppose that φ is a supersymmetric state on $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to the superderivation δ. Let $\left(\pi_\varphi,\ \mathscr{H}_\varphi,\ \Omega_\varphi\right)$ denote the GNS representation for φ, let $\mathfrak{M}_\varphi = \pi_\varphi(\mathcal{F})'' \subset \mathfrak{B}(\mathscr{H}_\varphi)$, and let $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ} = \pi_\varphi(\mathcal{A}_\circ)\Omega_\varphi$. Then*

$$\varphi \circ \delta_0 = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \mathcal{D}_{\delta_0}, \tag{5.1}$$

$$\varphi\left(\alpha_t(F)\right) = \varphi(F) \quad \text{for every} \quad t \in \mathbb{R} \quad \text{and}\ F \in \mathcal{F}. \tag{5.2}$$

Furthermore, there exists a σ-weakly continuous one-parameter group of $*$-automorphisms $\tilde{\alpha}_t$ of $\mathfrak{M}_\varphi$ such that

$$\pi_\varphi\left(\alpha_t(F)\right) = \tilde{\alpha}_t\left(\pi_\varphi(F)\right) = U(t)\pi_\varphi(F)U(t)^{-1} \quad \text{for every} \quad t \in \mathbb{R} \quad \text{and} \quad F \in \mathcal{F}, \tag{5.3}$$

where $U(t) \equiv e^{itH}$ ($t \in \mathbb{R}$) is the strongly continuous unitary group on $\mathscr{H}_\varphi$ generated by a self-adjoint operator H satisfying

$$H\Omega_\varphi = 0. \tag{5.4}$$

Also

$$\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ} \subset \mathrm{Dom}(H), \quad H\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi = \pi_\varphi\big(\delta_0(A)\big)\Omega_\varphi \quad \text{for every} \quad A \in \mathcal{A}_\circ, \tag{5.5}$$

and

$$H\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ} \subset \mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ}. \tag{5.6}$$

Proof. As φ is supersymmetric, $\varphi \circ \delta = 0$ on $\mathcal{A}_\circ$, and also $\varphi \circ \delta^* = 0$ on $\mathcal{A}_\circ$ due to (2.35). Thus from (3.9) (3.10) (3.12) it follows that $\varphi \circ \delta_0 = 0$ on $\mathcal{A}_\circ$. As this invariance can be extended from $\mathcal{A}_\circ$ to the whole $\mathcal{D}_{\delta_0}$ by (3.6), we have (5.1). As $\alpha_s(A) \in \mathcal{D}_{\delta_0}$ for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $A \in \mathcal{A}_\circ(\subset \mathcal{D}_{\delta_0})$, we have $\varphi\bigl(\alpha_t(A)\bigr) - \varphi\bigl(A\bigr) = i\int_0^t \varphi\bigl(\delta_0(\alpha_s(A))\bigr)ds = i\int_0^t 0 ds = 0$, i.e. α_t-invariance of φ on $\mathcal{A}_\circ$. As $\mathcal{A}_\circ$ is dense in $\mathcal{F}$ and α_t is strongly continuous, we obtain (5.2).

We can define for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$ a unitary operator $U(t)$ on $\mathscr{H}_\varphi$ by

$$U(t)\pi_\varphi(F)\Omega_\varphi := \pi_\varphi\bigl(\alpha_t(F)\bigr)\Omega_\varphi \ \text{ for } F \in \mathcal{F}, \tag{5.7}$$

since (5.2) yields for any $F, G \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(U(t)\pi_\varphi(G)\Omega_\varphi,\ U(t)\pi_\varphi(F)\Omega_\varphi\right) &= \left(\pi_\varphi\left(\alpha_t(G)\right)\Omega_\varphi,\ \pi_\varphi\left(\alpha_t(F)\right)\Omega_\varphi\right) \\
&= \left(\Omega_\varphi,\ \pi_\varphi\left(\alpha_t(G^*F)\right)\Omega_\varphi\right) \\
&= \varphi\left(\alpha_t(G^*F)\right) \\
&= \varphi\left(G^*F\right) \\
&= \left(\pi_\varphi(G)\Omega_\varphi,\ \pi_\varphi(F)\Omega_\varphi\right),
\end{aligned}$$

hence $U(t)$ given as (5.7) is isometric on the dense subspace $\pi_\varphi(\mathcal{F})\Omega_\varphi$, and it is uniquely extended to a unitary operator on $\mathscr{H}_\varphi$. By the strong continuity and the group property of α_t, $\{U(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ is a strongly continuous unitary group on $\mathscr{H}_\varphi$.

Let $\tilde{\alpha}_t := \mathrm{Ad}(U(t))$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, a unitary automorphism group on $\mathfrak{B}(\mathscr{H}_\varphi)$. By (5.7), we have for any $F, G \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
U(t)\pi_\varphi(F)U(t)^{-1}\pi_\varphi(G)\Omega_\varphi &= U(t)\pi_\varphi(F)\pi_\varphi\bigl(\alpha_{-t}(G)\bigr)\Omega_\varphi \\
&= U(t)\pi_\varphi\bigl(F\alpha_{-t}(G)\bigr)\Omega_\varphi \\
&= \pi_\varphi\bigl(\alpha_t(F)G\bigr)\Omega_\varphi \\
&= \pi_\varphi\bigl(\alpha_t(F)\bigr)\pi_\varphi(G)\Omega_\varphi.
\end{aligned}$$

As $\pi_\varphi(\mathcal{F})\Omega_\varphi$ is dense in $\mathscr{H}_\varphi$, we have $U(t)\pi_\varphi(F)U(t)^{-1} = \pi_\varphi\bigl(\alpha_t(F)\bigr)$. Furthermore, $\tilde{\alpha}_t$ gives a $*$-automorphism of $\mathfrak{M}_\varphi$ by extension. Therefore $\tilde{\alpha}_t$ ($t \in \mathbb{R}$) gives the desired σ-weakly continuous one-parameter group of $*$-automorphisms on $\mathfrak{M}_\varphi$.

By Stone's theorem [33, VIII.4] and $U(t)\Omega_\varphi = \Omega_\varphi$ due to (5.7), there exists a self-adjoint operator H such that $U(t) = e^{itH}$ and $H\Omega_\varphi = 0$, i.e. (5.4). Hence by (3.2) and (5.7),

$$\lim_{t\to 0}\frac{1}{t}\Bigl(U(t)\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi - \pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi\Bigr) = iH\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi = i\pi_\varphi\bigl(\delta_0(A)\bigr)\Omega_\varphi$$

is satisfied for any $A \in \mathcal{D}_{\delta_0}$, and obviously for any $A \in \mathcal{A}_\circ (\subset \mathcal{D}_{\delta_0})$. We have shown (5.5). Finally, (5.6) follows from (3.13) and (5.5). □

Proposition 5.2. *Assume the supersymmetric C^*-dynamics for Case* (I). *Let φ be a supersymmetric state on $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to the superderivation δ. Let Q denote the closed linear operator implementing the superderivation δ in the GNS representation $\left(\pi_\varphi,\ \mathscr{H}_\varphi,\ \Omega_\varphi\right)$ for φ, and let H denote the self-adjoint operator of the time generator in $\mathscr{H}_\varphi$ satisfying* (5.3) (5.4) *in Lemma* 5.1. *Define*

$$Q_{\mathrm{s},1} := Q + Q^* \quad Q_{\mathrm{s},2} := i(Q - Q^*) \tag{5.8}$$

with the domain $\mathrm{Dom}(Q_{\mathrm{s},1}) = \mathrm{Dom}(Q_{\mathrm{s},2}) = \mathrm{Dom}(Q) \cap \mathrm{Dom}(Q^*)$. *Then*

$$\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ} \subset \mathrm{Dom}(Q_{\mathrm{s},1}), \quad \mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ} \subset \mathrm{Dom}(Q_{\mathrm{s},2}), \tag{5.9}$$

$$Q_{\mathrm{s},1}\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi = \pi_\varphi\left(\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}(A)\right)\Omega_\varphi, \quad Q_{\mathrm{s},2}\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi = \pi_\varphi\left(\delta_{\mathrm{s},2}(A)\right)\Omega_\varphi \ \ \textit{for any} \ \ A \in \mathcal{A}_\circ \tag{5.10}$$

and

$$Q\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ} \subset \mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ},\ Q^*\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ} \subset \mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ},\ Q_{\mathrm{s},1}\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ} \subset \mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ},\ Q_{\mathrm{s},2}\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ} \subset \mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ}. \tag{5.11}$$

Furthermore

$$Q^2 = 0, \quad Q^{*2} = 0, \tag{5.12}$$

as unique extensions of densely defined bounded linear (i.e. zero) operators,

$$Q_{\mathrm{s},1}Q_{\mathrm{s},2} = -Q_{\mathrm{s},2}Q_{\mathrm{s},1} \quad \textit{on } \mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ}, \tag{5.13}$$

$$\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ} \subset \mathrm{Dom}(QQ^*) \cap \mathrm{Dom}(Q^*Q), \quad \mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ} \subset \mathrm{Dom}(Q_{\mathrm{s},1}^2), \quad \mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ} \subset \mathrm{Dom}(Q_{\mathrm{s},2}^2), \tag{5.14}$$

$$H = QQ^* + Q^*Q = Q_{\mathrm{s},1}^2 = Q_{\mathrm{s},2}^2 \quad \textit{on } \mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ}, \tag{5.15}$$

and

$$[H,\ Q] = [H,\ Q^*] = [H,\ Q_{\mathrm{s},1}] = [H,\ Q_{\mathrm{s},2}] = 0. \tag{5.16}$$

Proof. Let A denote an arbitrary element of $\mathcal{A}_\circ$. By (2.9) (4.1) (4.7) (5.8), we verify (5.9) and (5.10). From (3.9) (3.10) (4.1) (4.7) (5.10), we have (5.11). By (3.11)

$$QQ\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi = Q\pi_\varphi\left(\delta(A)\right)\Omega_\varphi = \pi_\varphi\left(\delta\big(\delta(A)\big)\right)\Omega_\varphi = \pi_\varphi\big(\delta \cdot \delta(A)\big)\Omega_\varphi = 0\Omega_\varphi = 0,$$

and

$$Q^* Q^* \pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi = 0.$$

Thus Q^2 and Q^{*2} vanish on $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ}$. Since $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ}$ is dense in $\mathscr{H}_\varphi$, their unique bounded extension are both 0, so (5.12) is shown. Similarly we obtain (5.13) from (3.15). By (3.12) (3.16),

$$\pi_\varphi\bigl(\delta_0(A)\bigr) = \pi_\varphi\bigl(\delta \cdot \delta^*(A) + \delta^* \cdot \delta(A)\bigr) = \pi_\varphi\bigl(\delta_{\mathrm{s},1} \cdot \delta_{\mathrm{s},1}(A)\bigr) = \pi_\varphi\bigl(\delta_{\mathrm{s},2} \cdot \delta_{\mathrm{s},2}(A)\bigr). \quad (5.17)$$

By (4.1) (4.7)

$$\pi_\varphi\bigl(\delta \cdot \delta^*(A) + \delta^* \cdot \delta(A)\bigr)\Omega_\varphi = (QQ^* + Q^*Q)\,\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi. \quad (5.18)$$

By (5.10)

$$\pi_\varphi\bigl(\delta_{\mathrm{s},1} \cdot \delta_{\mathrm{s},1}(A)\bigr)\Omega_\varphi = Q_{\mathrm{s},1}^2 \pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi, \quad \pi_\varphi\bigl(\delta_{\mathrm{s},2} \cdot \delta_{\mathrm{s},2}(A)\bigr)\Omega_\varphi = Q_{\mathrm{s},2}^2 \pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi. \quad (5.19)$$

Hence by (5.5) (5.17) (5.18) (5.19), we obtain (5.15). Using the algebraic relations (5.12) and (5.15), we verify the commutative relations in (5.16) on the dense space $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ}$. This is what (5.16) exactly means. □

Later in the proof of Theorem 5.11 in §5.3, we need a dense subspace of the GNS Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}_\varphi$ of a supersymmetric state φ that has some nice properties not possessed by $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ}$ in Case (I), see Remark 5.9 in §5.2. We will introduce such subspace in the following. Let $\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})$ denote the set of all infinitely differentiable functions on $\mathbb{R}$ whose any derivatives fall off more quickly than the inverse of any polynomial. For $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $f \in \mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})$, define the smeared element under the time development

$$F_f := \int dt f(t)\alpha_t(F) \in \mathcal{F}. \quad (5.20)$$

We see that F_f so defined belongs to $\mathcal{F}$ due to $f \in \mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})$ and the norm continuity of $\alpha_t(F)$ in $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Similarly, let

$$\pi_\varphi(F)_f := \int dt f(t)\tilde{\alpha}_t\bigl(\pi_\varphi(F)\bigr) = \pi_\varphi(F_f) \in \mathfrak{M}_\varphi, \quad (5.21)$$

where the Riemann integral is taken with respect to the σ-weak topology on $\mathfrak{M}_\varphi$. Let $\mathfrak{M}_{\varphi\,\circ\,\mathscr{S}}$ denote the finite linear span of

$$\bigl\{\pi_\varphi(A)_f;\ A \in \mathcal{A}_\circ \text{ and } f \in \mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})\bigr\}. \quad (5.22)$$

The subscripts of $\mathfrak{M}_{\varphi\,\circ\,\mathscr{S}}$ will indicate the state φ, the underlying subalgebra $\mathcal{A}_\circ$ and

$\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})$. Let

$$\mathscr{H}_{\varphi \circ \mathscr{S}} := \mathfrak{M}_{\varphi \circ \mathscr{S}} \Omega_\varphi \subset \mathscr{H}_\varphi. \tag{5.23}$$

It is a dense linear subspace of $\mathscr{H}_\varphi$, since $\pi_\varphi(\mathcal{A}_\circ)\Omega_\varphi$ is dense in $\mathscr{H}_\varphi$ by (3.5) and $\pi_\varphi(A)_{g_n}\Omega_\varphi \in \mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}} \longrightarrow \pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi$ as $n \to \infty$ for any $A \in \mathcal{A}_\circ$, where $g_n(t) := \sqrt{\frac{n}{\pi}} e^{-nt^2}$ $(n \in \mathbb{N})$ which tend to the delta function at $t = 0$ as $n \to \infty$. From (5.21) to (5.23), φ can be any state on $\mathcal{F}$. But as was noted before, the state denoted by φ is always supersymmetric.

Proposition 5.3. *Assume the supersymmetric C^*-dynamics for Case* (I)*. Suppose that φ is a supersymmetric state on $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to the superderivation δ. Let $\big(\pi_\varphi,\ \mathscr{H}_\varphi,\ \Omega_\varphi\big)$ denote the GNS representation for φ. Let H and $U(t) = e^{itH}$ $(t \in \mathbb{R})$ denote the self-adjoint operator and the unitary operator implementing the time development in the GNS representation as* (5.3) (5.4)*. Then for any $A \in \mathcal{A}_\circ$, $f \in \mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$*

$$U(s)\pi_\varphi(A)_f\Omega_\varphi = \pi_\varphi(A)_{f_s}\Omega_\varphi, \tag{5.24}$$

$$U(s)\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}} \subset \mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}}. \tag{5.25}$$

Also

$$\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}} \subset \mathrm{Dom}(H), \quad H\pi_\varphi(A)_f\Omega_\varphi = \frac{1}{i}\pi_\varphi(A)_{-f'}\Omega_\varphi = \pi_\varphi\big(\delta_0(A)\big)_f\Omega_\varphi, \tag{5.26}$$

where $f_s(t) := f(t-s)$ and $f'(t) = \frac{d}{dt}f(t)$, and

$$H\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}} \subset \mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}}. \tag{5.27}$$

Proof. By (5.21) (5.4) (5.3) we have for any $A \in \mathcal{A}_\circ$, $f \in \mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})$,

$$\begin{aligned} U(s)\pi_\varphi(A)_f\Omega_\varphi &= U(s)\int dt f(t)\tilde{\alpha}_t\big(\pi_\varphi(A)\big)\Omega_\varphi = U(s)\int dt f(t)\tilde{\alpha}_t\big(\pi_\varphi(A)\big)U(-s)\Omega_\varphi \\ &= \int dt f(t)\tilde{\alpha}_{t+s}\big(\pi_\varphi(A)\big)\Omega_\varphi = \int dt f_s(t)\tilde{\alpha}_t\big(\pi_\varphi(A)\big)\Omega_\varphi = \pi_\varphi(A)_{f_s}\Omega_\varphi, \end{aligned} \tag{5.28}$$

which is (5.24). The next (5.25) immediately follows (5.24). We see

$$\lim_{s\to 0}\frac{1}{is}\Big(U(s)\pi_\varphi(A)_f\Omega_\varphi - \pi_\varphi(A)_f\Omega_\varphi\Big) = \frac{1}{i}\frac{d}{ds}\pi_\varphi(A)_{f_s}\Omega_\varphi\Big|_{s=0} = \frac{1}{i}\pi_\varphi(A)_{-f'}\Omega_\varphi,$$

where the t-integral and the s-derivation on the formula (5.28) is exchanged, since $\frac{f(t-s)-f(t)}{s}$ converges to $-f'(t)$ uniformly in $t \in \mathbb{R}$ as $s \to 0$ due to $f \in \mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})$. Thus $\pi_\varphi(A)_f\Omega_\varphi \in \mathrm{Dom}(H)$ (which implies $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}} \subset \mathrm{Dom}(H)$), and $H\pi_\varphi(A)_f\Omega_\varphi = \frac{1}{i}\pi_\varphi(A)_{-f'}\Omega_\varphi$. By (5.3)

(5.4) (5.5), we have (5.26) as

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_\varphi\big(\delta_0(A)\big)_f\Omega_\varphi &= \int dt f(t)\tilde{\alpha}_t\big(\pi_\varphi(\delta_0(A))\big)\Omega_\varphi = \int dt f(t)U(t)\pi_\varphi\big(\delta_0(A)\big)\Omega_\varphi \\ &= \int dt f(t)U(t)H\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi = \int dt f(t)HU(t)\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi = H\pi_\varphi(A)_f\Omega_\varphi,\end{aligned}$$

where $e^{itH}H = He^{itH}$ on $\mathrm{Dom}(H)$ and the closedness of H are noted. Finally, (5.27) follows from (3.13) (5.26). □

Lemma 5.4. *Assume the supersymmetric C^*-dynamics for Case* (I). *Let φ be a supersymmetric state on $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to the superderivation δ. Let Q denote the closed linear operator implementing δ in the GNS Hilbert space for φ. Then for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$*

$$\pi_\varphi\big(\alpha_t(\mathcal{A}_\circ)\big)\Omega_\varphi \subset \mathrm{Dom}(Q), \tag{5.29}$$

$$Q\pi_\varphi\big(\alpha_t(A)\big)\Omega_\varphi = \pi_\varphi\left(\delta\big(\alpha_t(A)\big)\right)\Omega_\varphi = \pi_\varphi\left(\alpha_t\big(\delta(A)\big)\right)\Omega_\varphi \text{ for any } A \in \mathcal{A}_\circ. \tag{5.30}$$

Proof. By (3.19), Proposition 4.4 applies to every element of $\alpha_t(\mathcal{A}_\circ)$ giving (5.29) and

$$Q\pi_\varphi\big(\alpha_t(A)\big)\Omega_\varphi = \pi_\varphi\left(\delta\big(\alpha_t(A)\big)\right)\Omega_\varphi.$$

By this and (3.17), we have (5.30). □

Proposition 5.5. *Assume the supersymmetric C^*-dynamics for Case* (I). *Let φ be a supersymmetric state on $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to the superderivation δ. Let Q denote the closed linear operator implementing δ in the GNS Hilbert space for φ. Then*

$$\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}} \subset \mathrm{Dom}(Q),\ Q\pi_\varphi(A)_f\Omega_\varphi = \pi_\varphi\big(\delta(A)\big)_f\Omega_\varphi \text{ for any } A \in \mathcal{A}_\circ, f \in \mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}). \tag{5.31}$$

Proof. Take $\pi_\varphi(A)_f \in \mathfrak{M}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}}$ with $A \in \mathcal{A}_\circ$ and $f \in \mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})$. By definition (5.21), $\pi_\varphi(A)_f\Omega_\varphi \in \mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}}$ is approximated in norm by the Riemann sums

$$\sum_k f(t_k^\star)\pi_\varphi\big(\alpha_{t_k^\star}(A)\big)(t_k - t_{k-1})\Omega_\varphi \in \mathscr{H}_\varphi,\ t_k^\star \in [t_{k-1},\ t_k]. \tag{5.32}$$

By (5.30), each summand of this (5.32) is in $\mathrm{Dom}(Q)$ and

$$Q\pi_\varphi\big(\alpha_{t_k^\star}(A)\big)\Omega_\varphi = \pi_\varphi\left(\delta\big(\alpha_{t_k^\star}(A)\big)\right)\Omega_\varphi = \pi_\varphi\left(\alpha_{t_k^\star}\big(\delta(A)\big)\right)\Omega_\varphi.$$

As the Riemann sums

$$\sum_k f(t_k^\star)\pi_\varphi\left(\alpha_{t_k^\star}\big(\delta(A)\big)\right)(t_k - t_{k-1})\Omega_\varphi \tag{5.33}$$

converge to $\pi_\varphi\big(\delta(A)\big)_f\Omega_\varphi$ in norm and Q is closed, we obtain (5.31). □

Remark 5.6. It is obvious that Lemma 5.4 and Proposition 5.5 are valid for the superderivations δ^*, $\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}$ and $\delta_{\mathrm{s},2}$.

The formula of the supersymmetric Hamiltonian on $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}}$ is immediately given as follows. It is much the same way as that on $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ}$ (5.15).

Proposition 5.7. *Assume the supersymmetric* C^**-dynamics for Case* (I)*. Suppose that* φ *is a supersymmetric state on* $\mathcal{F}$ *with respect to the superderivation* δ*. Let* Q *denote the closed linear operator implementing* δ *in the GNS Hilbert space* $\mathscr{H}_\varphi$ *for* φ*. Similarly let* $Q_{\mathrm{s},1}$ *and* $Q_{\mathrm{s},2}$ *denote the closed symmetric operators implementing* $\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}$ *and* $\delta_{\mathrm{s},2}$ *in* $\mathscr{H}_\varphi$*, respectively. Let* H *denote the self-adjoint operator of the time generator in* $\mathscr{H}_\varphi$ *satisfying* (5.3) (5.4)*. Then*

$$\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}}\subset \mathrm{Dom}(Q^*Q),\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}}\subset \mathrm{Dom}(QQ^*),\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}}\subset \mathrm{Dom}(Q_{\mathrm{s},1}Q_{\mathrm{s},1}),\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}}\subset \mathrm{Dom}(Q_{\mathrm{s},2}Q_{\mathrm{s},2}) \tag{5.34}$$

and for any $A\in\mathcal{A}_\circ$ *and* $f\in\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})$

$$(Q^*Q+QQ^*)\pi_\varphi(A)_f\Omega_\varphi=Q_{\mathrm{s},1}^2\pi_\varphi(A)_f\Omega_\varphi=Q_{\mathrm{s},2}^2\pi_\varphi(A)_f\Omega_\varphi=H\pi_\varphi(A)_f\Omega_\varphi=\frac{1}{i}\pi_\varphi(A)_{-f'}\Omega_\varphi \tag{5.35}$$

Proof. By (3.9) (3.10) $\delta(A)\in\mathcal{A}_\circ,\delta^*(A)\in\mathcal{A}_\circ,\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}(A)\in\mathcal{A}_\circ,\delta_{\mathrm{s},2}(A)\in\mathcal{A}_\circ$ for any $A\in\mathcal{A}_\circ$. Hence using (5.31) in Proposition 5.5 and (3.12), we have

$$\begin{aligned}(Q^*Q+QQ^*)\pi_\varphi(A)_f\Omega_\varphi &= Q^*\pi_\varphi\big(\delta(A)\big)_f\Omega_\varphi+Q\pi_\varphi\big(\delta^*(A)\big)_f\Omega_\varphi=\pi_\varphi\big(\delta^*\cdot\delta(A)\big)_f\Omega_\varphi+\pi_\varphi\big(\delta\cdot\delta^*(A)\big)_f\Omega_\varphi\\ &= \pi_\varphi\big(\delta_0(A)\big)_f\Omega_\varphi.\end{aligned}$$

By (3.16), similarly

$$Q_{\mathrm{s},1}Q_{\mathrm{s},1}\pi_\varphi(A)_f\Omega_\varphi=Q_{\mathrm{s},2}Q_{\mathrm{s},2}\pi_\varphi(A)_f=\pi_\varphi\big(\delta_0(A)\big)_f\Omega_\varphi.$$

From these and (5.26), the statement follows. ☐

5.2 Preliminaries for Case (II)

In this subsection, suppose that the assumptions on C^*-dynamics (including the states) for Case (II) given in §3.2 are all satisfied. First the time-invariance of supersymmetric states will be shown.

Lemma 5.8. *Assume the supersymmetric* C^**-dynamics for Case* (II) *given in §3.2. Let* δ_{s} *denote the symmetric superderivation, and let* α_t *denote the one-parameter group of* $*$*-automorphisms. If* φ *is a supersymmetric state on* $\mathcal{F}$ *with respect to* δ_{s} *(in the sense of Definition* 2.4*), then* φ *is* α_t*-invariant,*

$$\varphi\left(\alpha_t(F)\right)=\varphi(F)\quad \textit{for every}\ \ t\in\mathbb{R}\ \ \textit{and}\ F\in\mathcal{F}. \tag{5.36}$$

There exists a σ*-weakly continuous one-parameter group of* $*$*-automorphisms* $\tilde{\alpha}_t$ *of* $\mathfrak{M}_\varphi$

(the von Neumann algebra generated by the GNS representation for φ) such that

$$\pi_{\varphi}\left(\alpha_t(F)\right)=\tilde{\alpha}_t\left(\pi_{\varphi}(F)\right)=U(t)\pi_{\varphi}(F)U(t)^{-1}\ \ \textit{for every}\ \ t\in\mathbb{R}\ \ \textit{and}\ \ F\in\mathcal{F}, \tag{5.37}$$

where $U(t)\equiv e^{itH}$ $(t\in\mathbb{R})$ *is the strongly continuous unitary group on* $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi}$ *generated by a self-adjoint operator* H *satisfying*

$$H\Omega_{\varphi}=0. \tag{5.38}$$

That is to say, in the formula (3.21) *for* $\omega=\varphi$*, the self-adjoint operator* H *is chosen so that* (5.38) *is satisfied. Also*

$$U(t)\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ}\subset\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ}\ \ \textit{for any}\ t\in\mathbb{R}, \tag{5.39}$$

$$\frac{d}{dt}U(t)\xi\Big|_{t=0}=iH\xi\ \ \textit{for any}\ \xi\in\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ}. \tag{5.40}$$

Proof. Let us take $\omega=\varphi$ and $\eta=\Omega_{\varphi}\in\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ}$ in (3.29) of Definition 3.14, which is the general formula of supersymmetric dynamics assumed for Case (II). We have then for any $A\in\mathcal{A}_{\circ}$

$$-i\frac{d}{dt}\varphi(M_{A,\lambda}\alpha_t(A))\Big|_{t=0}=-i\frac{d}{dt}\left(\Omega_{\varphi},\ \pi_{\varphi}\big(M_{A,\lambda}\alpha_t(A)\big)\Omega_{\varphi}\right)\Big|_{t=0}=\left(\Omega_{\varphi},\ \pi_{\omega}\big(M_{A,\lambda}\delta_{\mathrm{s}}^2(A)\big)\Omega_{\varphi}\right)=\varphi\left(M_{A,\lambda}\delta_{\mathrm{s}}^2(A)\right) \tag{5.41}$$

Recalling (3.28) we compute the right-hand side of this as

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi\left(M_{A,\lambda}\delta_{\mathrm{s}}^2(A)\right)&=\varphi\left(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}\big(M_{A,\lambda}\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\big)\right)-\varphi\left(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(M_{A,\lambda})\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\right)\\&=-\left(\Omega_{\varphi},\ \pi_{\varphi}\big(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(M_{A,\lambda})\big)\pi_{\varphi}\big(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\big)\Omega_{\varphi}\right),\end{aligned}$$

where δ_{s}-invariance of φ on $\mathcal{A}_{\circ}$ and $M_{A,\lambda}\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\in\mathcal{A}_{\circ}$ are noted. Hence as $\lambda\to\infty$, the right-hand side of (5.41) converges to 0 due to (3.27), while the left-hand side of (5.41) converges to $-i\frac{d}{dt}\varphi\left(\alpha_t(A)\right)\Big|_{t=0}$ due to (3.26). Thus for any $A\in\mathcal{A}_{\circ}$

$$\frac{d}{dt}\varphi\left(\alpha_t(A)\right)\Big|_{t=0}=0.$$

As $\alpha_t(A)\in\mathcal{A}_{\circ}$ for every $t\in\mathbb{R}$ by (3.24), this implies

$$\frac{d}{dt}\varphi\left(\alpha_t(A)\right)=0,$$

accordingly

$$\varphi\left(\alpha_t(A)\right)=\varphi(A)\ \ \text{for every}\ \ t\in\mathbb{R},\ A\in\mathcal{A}_{\circ}. \tag{5.42}$$

We shall remove the restriction '$A\in\mathcal{A}_{\circ}$' in the above. *Define* a linear operator $U(t)$ on

$\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ}$ by

$$U(t)\pi_{\varphi}(A)\Omega_{\varphi} := \pi_{\varphi}\big(\alpha_t(A)\big)\Omega_{\varphi} \ \text{ for } A \in \mathcal{A}_{\circ}. \tag{5.43}$$

By using (5.42) (5.43) we see for any $A, B \in \mathcal{A}_{\circ}$

$$\begin{aligned}
(U(t)\pi_{\varphi}(B)\Omega_{\varphi},\ U(t)\pi_{\varphi}(A)\Omega_{\varphi}) &= (\pi_{\varphi}(\alpha_t(B))\,\Omega_{\varphi},\ \pi_{\varphi}(\alpha_t(A))\,\Omega_{\varphi}) \\
&= (\Omega_{\varphi},\ \pi_{\varphi}(\alpha_t(B^*A))\,\Omega_{\varphi}) \\
&= \varphi(\alpha_t(B^*A)) \\
&= \varphi(B^*A) \\
&= (\pi_{\varphi}(B)\Omega_{\varphi},\ \pi_{\varphi}(A)\Omega_{\varphi})\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $U(t)$ is a (well-defined) isometry on the dense subspace $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ}$ and it extends uniquely to a unitary operator on $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi}$. Such unitary operator will be denoted by the same symbol $U(t)$. For any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ fixed, the map $\pi_{\varphi}(F) \to \pi_{\varphi}(\alpha_t(F))$, $F \in \mathcal{F}$, is given as a unitarily implemented isomorphism of $\pi_{\varphi}(\mathcal{F})$ by (3.21). Thus it follows from (3.20) (5.43) that

$$U(t)\pi_{\varphi}(F)\Omega_{\varphi} = \pi_{\varphi}\big(\alpha_t(F)\big)\Omega_{\varphi} \ \text{ for every } F \in \mathcal{F}. \tag{5.44}$$

By the defining relation (5.43) and the continuity of $\pi_{\varphi}(\alpha_t(A))$ with respect to $t \in \mathbb{R}$ in the strong operator topology (3.21), $\{U(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ gives a strongly continuous unitary group satisfying

$$U(t)\Omega_{\varphi} = \Omega_{\varphi}. \tag{5.45}$$

Hence by Stone's theorem, there is a self-adjoint operator H such that

$$U(t) = e^{itH}, \quad H\Omega_{\varphi} = 0.$$

By (5.44), for any $F, G, K \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\big(\pi_{\varphi}(K)\Omega_{\varphi},\ U(t)\pi_{\varphi}(F)U(t)^{-1}\pi_{\varphi}(G)\Omega_{\varphi}\big) &= \big(\pi_{\varphi}(K)\Omega_{\varphi},\ U(t)\pi_{\varphi}(F)\pi_{\varphi}\big(\alpha_{-t}(G)\big)\Omega_{\varphi}\big) \\
&= \big(\pi_{\varphi}(K)\Omega_{\varphi},\ U(t)\pi_{\varphi}\big(F\alpha_{-t}(G)\big)\Omega_{\varphi}\big) \\
&= \big(\pi_{\varphi}(K)\Omega_{\varphi},\ \pi_{\varphi}\big(\alpha_t(F)G\big)\Omega_{\varphi}\big) \\
&= \big(\pi_{\varphi}(K)\Omega_{\varphi},\ \pi_{\varphi}\big(\alpha_t(F)\big)\pi_{\varphi}(G)\Omega_{\varphi}\big)\,.
\end{aligned}$$

As $\pi(\mathcal{F})\Omega_{\varphi}(\supset \mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ})$ is dense in $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi}$, $U(t)\pi_{\varphi}(F)U(t)^{-1} = \pi_{\varphi}\big(\alpha_t(F)\big)$ for every $F \in \mathcal{F}$. This together with (5.45) yields (5.36). Let for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\tilde{\alpha}_t(X) := U(t)XU(t)^{-1} \ \text{ for } X \in \mathfrak{M}_{\varphi}. \tag{5.46}$$

This gives a σ-weakly continuous one-parameter group of $*$-automorphisms of $\mathfrak{M}_{\varphi}$ that fulfills (5.37) (5.38) so far been shown. From (3.24) (5.43) we have (5.39). As it has been shown that $\{U(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ given in this proof is a special example (satisfying (5.38)) of that in (3.21), (5.40) obviously follows from (3.22). $\square$

Remark 5.9. The above (5.39) does not hold for Case (I). This is because in general (3.24) is invalid for Case (I).

Proposition 5.10. *Assume the supersymmetric C^*-dynamics for Case* (II)*. Suppose that φ is a supersymmetric state with respect to the symmetric superderivation δ_{s}. Let Q_{s} denote the closed symmetric operator implementing δ_{s}, and let H denote the self-adjoint operator of the time generator satisfying* (5.37) (5.38) *in the GNS Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}_\varphi$ for φ. Then*

$$\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ} \subset \mathrm{Dom}(Q_{\mathrm{s}}^2), \quad H = Q_{\mathrm{s}}^2 \ \ \text{on } \mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ}. \tag{5.47}$$

Proof. By taking $\omega=\varphi$ and $\eta=\Omega_\varphi\in\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ}$ in (3.29), for any $A\in\mathcal{A}_\circ$

$$\begin{aligned} -i\frac{d}{dt}\pi_\varphi\big(M_{A,\lambda}\alpha_t(A)\big)\Omega_\varphi\Big|_{t=0} &= \pi_\varphi\big(M_{A,\lambda}\delta_{\mathrm{s}}^2(A)\big)\Omega_\varphi \\ &= \pi_\varphi\left(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}\big(M_{A,\lambda}\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\big)\right)\Omega_\varphi - \pi_\varphi\left(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(M_{A,\lambda})\right)\pi_\varphi\left(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\right)\Omega_\varphi \end{aligned} \tag{5.48}$$

By (5.37) (5.38) (5.40), the left-hand side of (5.48) is $\pi(M_{A,\lambda})H\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi$, while the right-hand side of (5.48) is $Q_{\mathrm{s}}\pi_\varphi\big(M_{A,\lambda}\big)Q_{\mathrm{s}}\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi - \pi_\varphi\big(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(M_{A,\lambda})\big)Q_{\mathrm{s}}\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi$ by $Q_{\mathrm{s}}\pi_\varphi(B)\Omega_\varphi = \pi_\varphi\big(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(B)\big)\Omega_\varphi$ for any $B\in\mathcal{A}_\circ$ due to (4.1) and $M_{A,\lambda}\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\in\mathcal{A}_\circ$ due to (3.25). Therefore

$$M_{A,\lambda}H\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi + \pi_\varphi\big(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(M_{A,\lambda})\big)Q_{\mathrm{s}}\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi = Q_{\mathrm{s}}\pi_\varphi\big(M_{A,\lambda}\big)Q_{\mathrm{s}}\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi. \tag{5.49}$$

By (3.26) the first term in the left-hand side of (5.49) converges to $H\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi$, and by (3.27) the second term converges to 0 as $\lambda\to\infty$. Let us consider the right-hand side of (5.49). Since $\pi_\varphi\big(M_{A,\lambda}\big)Q_{\mathrm{s}}\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi \to Q_{\mathrm{s}}\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi$ as $\lambda\to\infty$ due to (3.26), and Q_{s} is closed by definition, we conclude that $Q_{\mathrm{s}}\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi\in\mathrm{Dom}(Q_{\mathrm{s}})$ and $Q_{\mathrm{s}}Q_{\mathrm{s}}\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi = H\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi$. Now (5.47) is shown. $\square$

5.3 Self-adjointness of supercharges and the supersymmetry algebra realized in the GNS space

The state φ under consideration remains to be supersymmetric in this final part of §5. We shall provide 'complete' operator equalities representing the supersymmetry algebra based on the preliminary ones given in §5.1 for Case (I) and in §5.2 for Case (II). In this subsection, we treat both Case (I) and Case (II), and we shall always consider *symmetric* superderivation δ_{s}. As was noted in Remark 2.1 of §2, δ_{s} will denote $\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}$ or $\delta_{\mathrm{s},2}$ given as (2.9) for Case (I). Hence in Case (I), the supersymmetric dynamics in terms of $\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}$ and $\delta_{\mathrm{s},2}$ as in Proposition 3.6 is now satisfied by δ_{s}. Of course, in Case (II) the supersymmetric dynamics in Definition 3.14 is satisfied by δ_{s}.

In the next theorem we will show the self-adjointness of the supercharge operators using a proof method found e.g. in [23, Prop.4.5] [27, Lem.5.7]. It is based on the following basic fact of functional analysis, see e.g. [33, Th. VIII.3, Th. X.24]: *Suppose that T is a symmetric operator on a Hilbert space. Then T is essentially self-adjoint if and only if* $\mathrm{Ran}(T \pm iI)$ *is dense. Suppose that T is a non-negative symmetric operator on a Hilbert space. Then T is essentially self-adjoint if and only if* $\mathrm{Ran}(T + I)$ *is dense.*

Theorem 5.11. *Assume the supersymmetric C^*-dynamics for Case* (I) *given in* §3.1 *or that for Case* (II) *given in* §3.2. *Assume that the superderivation is symmetric and it is denoted as δ_{s}. Suppose that φ is a supersymmetric state on $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to δ_{s}. Let $\big(\pi_\varphi,\ \mathscr{H}_\varphi,\ \Omega_\varphi\big)$ denote the GNS representation for φ. Let Q_{s} denote the closed symmetric operator implementing δ_{s} in the GNS space $\mathscr{H}_\varphi$, and let H denote the self-adjoint operator of the time generator in $\mathscr{H}_\varphi$ given in Lemma* 5.1 *or in Lemma* 5.8. *Then (by definition)*

$$Q_{\mathrm{s}}\Omega_\varphi = 0 = H\Omega_\varphi. \tag{5.50}$$

Furthermore

$$H = Q_{\mathrm{s}}^2 \tag{5.51}$$

as the exact operator equality, and any core of H is a core for Q_{s}.

Proof. First of all, remark that (5.50) stated in this theorem has been already given in (4.2) and (5.4) (5.38). (For the purpose of convenient reference, we put them here together giving the new equation number.)

We consider Case (I). By (5.25) (5.26) $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}}$ is invariant under the unitary operators $U(t) = e^{itH}$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and $U(t)$ is strongly differentiable with respect to $t \in \mathbb{R}$ on any element of $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}}$. As $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}}$ is dense in $\mathscr{H}_\varphi$, H is essentially self-adjoint on $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}}$ by the famous result [33, Th. VIII.10].

As Q_{s} is symmetric, $Q_{\mathrm{s}}^* Q_{\mathrm{s}} \supset Q_{\mathrm{s}} Q_{\mathrm{s}}$. By this together with (5.35) $H = Q_{\mathrm{s}}^* Q_{\mathrm{s}}$ on $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}}$, so H is positive on $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}}$. (Note that Q_{s} refers to $Q_{\mathrm{s},1}$ or $Q_{\mathrm{s},2}$ in (5.35).) Since $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}}$ is a core of the self-adjoint H as we have noted, H is a positive operator. Hence $\mathrm{Ran}(H+I)\lceil_{\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}}}$ is dense in $\mathscr{H}_\varphi$. By (5.35), $H+I = (Q_{\mathrm{s}}+iI)(Q_{\mathrm{s}}-iI) = (Q_{\mathrm{s}}-iI)(Q_{\mathrm{s}}+iI)$ on $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}}$, and hence each of $\mathrm{Ran}(Q_{\mathrm{s}} + iI)\lceil_{\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}}}$ and $\mathrm{Ran}(Q_{\mathrm{s}} - iI)\lceil_{\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}}}$ is dense in $\mathscr{H}_\varphi$. Therefore, as Q_{s} is symmetric, it is essentially self-adjoint on $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}}$. As Q_{s} is assumed to be a closed operator, it is self-adjoint. Accordingly Q_{s}^2 is self-adjoint on the same domain as Q_{s}. We have seen that H and Q_{s}^2 are self-adjoint operators that coincide on $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}}$. As $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}}$ is a core for H, the exact operator equality (5.51) is satisfied. This immediately implies that any core of H is a core for Q_{s} by repeating the above argument.

For Case (II) we can use the same proof as above by taking simply $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ}$ in place of $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}}$. This is because in Case (II) $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ}$ is invariant under $U(t)$ (5.39) and $U(t)$ is strongly differentiable with respect to $t \in \mathbb{R}$ on each element of $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\,\circ}$ (5.40). □

Theorem 5.12. *Assume the supersymmetric C^*-dynamics for Case* (I) *given in* §3.1 *or that for Case* (II) *given in* §3.2. *Suppose that φ is a supersymmetric state on $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to the symmetric superderivation δ_{s}. Let $\big(\pi_\varphi,\ \mathscr{H}_\varphi,\ \Omega_\varphi\big)$ denote the GNS representation for*

φ. Let $Q_{\rm s}$ denote the closed symmetric operator implementing $\delta_{\rm s}$ in $\mathscr{H}_\varphi$. Suppose further that the supersymmetric state φ is even. Let Γ denote the self-adjoint unitary operator implementing the grading automorphism in $\mathscr{H}_\varphi$ by $\mathrm{Ad}(\Gamma)$ *as* (2.26) (2.27) (2.28)*. Then*

$$\Gamma \mathrm{Dom}(Q_{\rm s}) = \mathrm{Dom}(Q_{\rm s}), \quad \mathrm{Ad}(\Gamma)(Q_{\rm s}) = -Q_{\rm s}, \tag{5.52}$$

and

$$Q_{\rm s} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & D^* \\ D & 0 \end{pmatrix} \ \text{on} \ \ \mathscr{H}_\varphi = \mathscr{H}_{\varphi+} \oplus \mathscr{H}_{\varphi-}, \tag{5.53}$$

where D is a densely defined closed operator from $\mathrm{Dom}(D) \subset \mathscr{H}_{\varphi+}$ *to* $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi-}$*.*

Proof. First we consider Case (I). By the oddness of the superderivation (2.3) together with (2.20) (2.27) (2.28) (5.31), we have for any $\pi_\varphi(A)_f\Omega_\varphi \in \mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}}$, $A \in \mathcal{A}_\circ, f \in \mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma Q_{\rm s}\pi_\varphi(A)_f\Omega_\varphi &= \Gamma\pi_\varphi\big(\delta_{\rm s}(A)\big)_f\Omega_\varphi = \Gamma\pi_\varphi\big(\delta_{\rm s}(A)\big)_f\Gamma\Omega_\varphi \\ &= \pi_\varphi\big(\gamma(\delta_{\rm s}(A))\big)_f\Omega_\varphi = -\pi_\varphi\big(\delta_{\rm s}(\gamma(A))\big)_f\Omega_\varphi \\ &= -Q_{\rm s}\pi_\varphi\big(\gamma(A)\big)_f\Omega_\varphi = -Q_{\rm s}\left(\Gamma\pi_\varphi(A)_f\Gamma\right)\Omega_\varphi \\ &= -Q_{\rm s}\Gamma\pi_\varphi(A)_f\Omega_\varphi. \end{aligned} \tag{5.54}$$

As $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ\mathscr{S}}$ is a core for H, and it is also a core for the closed operator $Q_{\rm s}$ by Theorem 5.11, (5.54) implies $\Gamma\mathrm{Dom}(Q_{\rm s}) \subset \mathrm{Dom}(Q_{\rm s})$ and $\Gamma Q_{\rm s} \subset -Q_{\rm s}\Gamma$. Noting $\Gamma^{-1} = \Gamma$ we have $\mathrm{Dom}(Q_{\rm s}) = \Gamma\Gamma\mathrm{Dom}(Q_{\rm s}) \subset \Gamma\mathrm{Dom}(Q_{\rm s})$. Therefore (5.52) follows.

For Case (II), we can similarly derive $\Gamma Q_{\rm s} = -Q_{\rm s}\Gamma$ on $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ}$ (5.54). As $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ}$ is a core for H, it is also a core for $Q_{\rm s}$. Therefore (5.52) holds in much the same way.

By (2.33) (5.52) $Q_{\rm s}$ has the off-diagonal matrix form, and by [27, 5.18 in §5.2.2] (5.53) is shown. ☐

Remark 5.13. For the other convention $\Gamma\Omega_\omega = -\Omega_\omega$, namely, ω being fermionic as well, (5.54) is valid as $1 \times 1 = (-1) \times (-1)$.

Remark 5.14. We shall make a comment upon how to generalize the results given in this subsection to general (not necessarily symmetric) superderivations. Let δ be a non-symmetric superderivation that satisfies the nilpotent condition '$\delta \cdot \delta = \mathbf{0}$'. There are two symmetric superderivations $\delta_{\rm s,1}$ and $\delta_{\rm s,2}$ (2.9) corresponding to δ. The supersymmetric dynamics in the sense of Proposition 3.6 for Case (I) and that in the sense of Definition 3.14 for Case (II) will be satisfied by each of $\delta_{\rm s,1}$ and $\delta_{\rm s,2}$. Suppose that φ is an even supersymmetric state with respect to δ. By Proposition 2.5 φ is also supersymmetric with respect to $\delta_{\rm s,1}$ and $\delta_{\rm s,2}$. Hence by applying each of $\delta_{\rm s,1}$ and $\delta_{\rm s,2}$ to $\delta_{\rm s}$ in Theorems 5.11 5.12, it follows that $Q_{\rm s,1}$ and $Q_{\rm s,2}$ are both self-adjoint operators satisfying

$$Q_{\rm s,1}\Omega_\varphi = 0 = Q_{\rm s,2}\Omega_\varphi, \quad H = Q_{\rm s,1}^2 = Q_{\rm s,2}^2, \quad \mathrm{Ad}(\Gamma)(Q_{\rm s,1}) = -Q_{\rm s,1}, \ \mathrm{Ad}(\Gamma)(Q_{\rm s,2}) = -Q_{\rm s,2}. \tag{5.55}$$

The above argument leading to (5.55) is not completely rigorous in Case (II), whereas it is rigorous in Case (I). Let us indicate the problems by comparing Case (II) with Case (I). In Case (I), the nilpotent condition is exactly (3.11) in Definition 3.3. In Case (II), however, the nilpotent condition is not explicitly defined; it should be properly formulated (probably by using the mollifiers as in Definition 3.14). In Case (I) the equivalence of the supersymmetric dynamics in terms of δ and its conjugate δ^* as in Definition 3.3 and that in terms of symmetric $\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}$ and $\delta_{\mathrm{s},2}$ as in Proposition 3.6 has been verified. For Case (II), having exploited such equivalence of the supersymmetric dynamics without proof, we have claimed that each of $\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}$ and $\delta_{\mathrm{s},2}$ satisfies the supersymmetric dynamics in Definition 3.14.

6 Set of supersymmetric states

We shall study the set of supersymmetric states in the state space of the C^*-algebra. First we recall the precise mathematical meaning of ground states, see e.g. [5, Def. 5.3.18].

Definition 6.1. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a C^*-algebra. Let α_t ($t \in \mathbb{R}$) be a one-parameter group of $*$-automorphisms on $\mathcal{F}$, and let ψ be a state on $\mathcal{F}$. Let $\left(\pi_\psi,\ \mathscr{H}_\psi,\ \Omega_\psi\right)$ denote the GNS representation for ψ. Suppose that there is a self-adjoint operator H that implements α_t in the GNS Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}_\psi$ as

$$U(t) = e^{itH}, \quad \pi_\psi\left(\alpha_t(F)\right) = U(t)\pi_\psi(F)U(t)^{-1} \text{ for } F \in \mathcal{F}.$$

If H is non-negative,

$$H \geq 0,$$

and H annihilates the cyclic vector,

$$H\Omega_\psi = 0,$$

then ψ is called a ground state with respect to α_t.

Note that this definition is very general, not requiring other assumptions on α_t and $\mathcal{F}$. ($\mathcal{F}$ does not need the grading structure.) The next two statements were already given in [1, Prop. 2.2] under a similar setting to Case (I). Our new proof is based on Theorem 5.11, the supersymmetry algebra realized in the GNS Hilbert space for a supersymmetric state, and it works for both Case (I) and Case (II). In this section, by using an abuse of notation, the superderivation under consideration is denoted as δ, whether it be symmetric (as is always the case in Case (II)) or non-symmetric.

Theorem 6.2. *Assume the supersymmetric C^*-dynamics for Case* (I) *given in* §3.1 *or that for Case* (II) *given in* §3.2. *If φ is a supersymmetric state on $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to the (symmetric or non-symmetric) superderivation δ, then it is a ground state with respect to the time automorphism group α_t.*

Proof. By (5.50) (5.51) in Theorem 5.11 the condition of Definition 6.1 is satisfied. Therefore φ is a ground state with respect to α_t. $\square$

Theorem 6.3. *Assume the supersymmetric C^*-dynamics for Case* (I) *given in* §3.1 *or that for Case* (II) *given in* §3.2*. Then the set of supersymmetric states with respect to the (symmetric or non-symmetric) superderivation δ is a face in the state space of $\mathcal{F}$. That is to say, if a supersymmetric state φ on $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to δ is written as a finite convex sum of states, i.e. $\varphi(F) = \sum_i \lambda_i \varphi_i(F)$ holds for every $F \in \mathcal{F}$, where $\lambda_i > 0$, $\sum_i \lambda_i = 1$, and each φ_i is a state on $\mathcal{F}$, then each φ_i is supersymmetric with respect to δ.*

Proof. For a given superderivation δ, if the statement is true for the symmetric $\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}$ and $\delta_{\mathrm{s},2}$ given as (2.9), then it is true for δ by Proposition 2.5. Thus it is enough to prove the statement for any *symmetric* superderivation δ_{s} satisfying the assumption. (Note that for Case (II) the superderivation is always symmetric §3.2.)

Due to [5, Th.2.3.19.], for any component state φ_i in the state decomposition of φ there exists a projection p' in the commutant $\mathfrak{M}'_\varphi$ of $\mathfrak{M}_\varphi$ in $\mathfrak{B}(\mathscr{H}_\varphi)$ such that $c := \varphi(p') = \big(\Omega_\varphi,\ p'\Omega_\varphi\big) > 0$ and

$$\varphi_i(F) = \frac{1}{c}\big(p'\Omega_\varphi,\ \pi_\varphi(F)p'\Omega_\varphi\big) = \frac{1}{c}\big(\Omega_\varphi,\ \pi_\varphi(F)p'\Omega_\varphi\big) \quad \text{for} \quad F \in \mathcal{F}, \tag{6.1}$$

where we recall $\varphi(F) = \big(\Omega_\varphi,\ \pi_\varphi(F)\Omega_\varphi\big)$. Since φ is a ground state by Theorem 6.2, the positive Hamiltonian H is *affiliated to* $\mathfrak{M}_\varphi$ [32] [16, Coro.2.4.7]. By this we mean that H commutes with any operator in $\mathfrak{M}'_\varphi$ [5, Def.2.5.7]. Thus $p'\mathrm{Dom}(H) \subset \mathrm{Dom}(H)$, $p'H \subset Hp'$. From this and (5.50) it follows that

$$p'\Omega_\varphi \in \mathrm{Dom}(H), \quad Hp'\Omega_\varphi = 0. \tag{6.2}$$

By (6.1) $\big(\pi_\varphi,\ p'\mathscr{H}_\varphi,\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{c}}p'\Omega_\varphi\big)$ gives a GNS representation of the state φ_i on $\mathcal{F}$, and this generates the von Neumann algebra $\mathfrak{M}_\varphi p'$ on the Hilbert space $p'\mathscr{H}_\varphi$. By (5.51) and (6.2), we have

$$0 = \big(p'\Omega_\varphi,\ Hp'\Omega_\varphi\big) = \big(p'\Omega_\varphi,\ Q_{\mathrm{s}}^2 p'\Omega_\varphi\big) = \big(Q_{\mathrm{s}}p'\Omega_\varphi,\ Q_{\mathrm{s}}p'\Omega_\varphi\big),$$

hence

$$p'\Omega_\varphi \in \mathrm{Dom}(Q_{\mathrm{s}}), \quad Q_{\mathrm{s}}p'\Omega_\varphi = 0.$$

By this we have for any $A \in \mathcal{A}_\circ$

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi_i\big(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\big) &= \frac{1}{c}\big(p'\Omega_\varphi,\ \pi_\varphi\big(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\big)p'\Omega_\varphi\big) = \frac{1}{c}\big(p'\Omega_\varphi,\ p'\pi_\varphi\big(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\big)\Omega_\varphi\big) \\
&= \frac{1}{c}\big(p'\Omega_\varphi,\ p'Q_{\mathrm{s}}\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi\big) = \frac{1}{c}\big(p'\Omega_\varphi,\ Q_{\mathrm{s}}\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi\big) \\
&= \frac{1}{c}\big(Q_{\mathrm{s}}p'\Omega_\varphi,\ \pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi\big) \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus φ_i is invariant under δ_{s} on $\mathcal{A}_\circ$, i.e. it is supersymmetric with respect to δ_{s}. $\square$

7 Supercharges affiliated to the von Neumann algebra

It is well known (and was used in the proof of Theorem 6.3) that for any ground state the Hamiltonian realized in the GNS Hilbert space is affiliated to the von Neumann algebra generated by the GNS representation. We shall show a similar statement for supercharges induced by supersymmetric states. If the (supersymmetric) vacuum state is unique, then $\mathfrak{M}_\varphi = \mathfrak{B}(\mathscr{H}_\varphi)$ [16, Coro.2.4.10] and hence the self-adjoint operator Q_{s} is obviously affiliated to $\mathfrak{M}_\varphi$. But such assumption is not necessary. In this section, we consider symmetric superderivations.

Theorem 7.1. *Assume the supersymmetric C^*-dynamics for Case* (I) *or Case* (II)*. Suppose that φ is an even supersymmetric state on $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to the symmetric superderivation δ_{s}. Let $(\pi_\varphi,\ \mathscr{H}_\varphi,\ \Omega_\varphi)$ denote the GNS representation for φ, and let $\mathfrak{M}_\varphi(\subset \mathfrak{B}(\mathscr{H}_\varphi))$ denote the von Neumann algebra generated by the GNS representation. Let Q_{s} denote the self-adjoint supercharge operator implementing δ_{s} in $\mathscr{H}_\varphi$. Then Q_{s} is affiliated to the von Neumann algebra $\mathfrak{M}_\varphi$.*

Proof. We have to show that for each projection $p' \in \mathfrak{M}_\varphi'$

$$p'\mathrm{Dom}(Q_{\mathrm{s}}) \subset \mathrm{Dom}(Q_{\mathrm{s}}), \quad Q_{\mathrm{s}}p' = p'Q_{\mathrm{s}} \ \text{ on } \ \mathrm{Dom}(Q_{\mathrm{s}}). \tag{7.1}$$

Let $c := \varphi(p') = \big(\Omega_\varphi,\ p'\Omega_\varphi\big) = \big(p'\Omega_\varphi,\ p'\Omega_\varphi\big)$. Then $c = 0$ if and only if $p'\Omega_\varphi = 0$. This implies $p' = 0$, since for any $X \in \mathfrak{M}_\varphi$, $p'X\Omega_\varphi = Xp'\Omega_\varphi = 0$ and $\mathfrak{M}_\varphi\Omega_\varphi$ is dense in $\mathscr{H}_\varphi$. For $p' \in \mathfrak{M}_\varphi'$ with the above $c \neq 0$, let φ_i denote the state on $\mathcal{F}$ whose cyclic vector is $\frac{1}{\sqrt{c}}p'\Omega_\varphi$ in the Hilbert space $p'\mathscr{H}_\varphi$ as given in (6.1). By Theorem 6.3 φ_i is supersymmetric with respect to δ_{s}. Hence for any $A, B \in \mathcal{A}_\circ$,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= c\varphi_i\Big(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}\big(\gamma(B^*)A\big)\Big)\\
&= \Big(\Omega_\varphi,\ \pi_\varphi\big(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(\gamma(B^*)A)\big)p'\Omega_\varphi\Big)\\
&= \Big(\Omega_\varphi,\ \pi_\varphi\big(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(\gamma(B^*))A + B^*\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\big)p'\Omega_\varphi\Big)\\
&= \Big(\Omega_\varphi,\ \pi_\varphi\big(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(\gamma(B^*))\big)\pi_\varphi(A)p'\Omega_\varphi\Big) + \Big(\Omega_\varphi,\ \pi_\varphi(B^*)\pi_\varphi\big(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\big)p'\Omega_\varphi\Big)\\
&= \Big(\pi_\varphi\big(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(\gamma(B^*))\big)^*\Omega_\varphi,\ \pi_\varphi(A)p'\Omega_\varphi\Big) + \Big(\pi_\varphi(B^*)^*\Omega_\varphi,\ \pi_\varphi\big(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\big)p'\Omega_\varphi\Big)\\
&= \Big(\pi_\varphi\big(-\delta_{\mathrm{s}}^*(B)\big)\Omega_\varphi,\ \pi_\varphi(A)p'\Omega_\varphi\Big) + \Big(\pi_\varphi(B)\Omega_\varphi,\ \pi_\varphi\big(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\big)p'\Omega_\varphi\Big)\\
&= \Big(\pi_\varphi\big(-\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(B)\big)\Omega_\varphi,\ \pi_\varphi(A)p'\Omega_\varphi\Big) + \Big(\pi_\varphi(B)\Omega_\varphi,\ \pi_\varphi\big(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\big)p'\Omega_\varphi\Big),
\end{aligned}$$

where we noted (2.6) and $\delta_{\mathrm{s}} = \delta_{\mathrm{s}}^*$. As $p' \in \mathfrak{M}_\varphi'$, this becomes

$$\Big(\pi_\varphi\big(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(B)\big)\Omega_\varphi,\ p'\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi\Big) = \Big(\pi_\varphi(B)\Omega_\varphi,\ p'\pi_\varphi\big(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\big)\Omega_\varphi\Big).$$

Noting the definition of $Q_{\rm s}$ we have

$$\Big(Q_{\rm s}\pi_\varphi(B)\Omega_\varphi,\ p'\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi\Big) = \Big(\pi_\varphi(B)\Omega_\varphi,\ p'Q_{\rm s}\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi\Big). \tag{7.2}$$

Since $Q_{\rm s} = \overline{Q_{\rm s}|_{\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ}}}$ by the definition of $Q_{\rm s}$ and it is self-adjoint by Theorem 5.11, (7.2) implies that $p'\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi \in {\rm Dom}(Q_{\rm s}^*) = {\rm Dom}(Q_{\rm s})$ and

$$Q_{\rm s}p'\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi = p'Q_{\rm s}\pi_\varphi(A)\Omega_\varphi.$$

As the above A is an arbitrary element in $\mathcal{A}_\circ$,

$$Q_{\rm s}p' = p'Q_{\rm s} \ \text{ on } \ \mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ}. \tag{7.3}$$

Now take any $\eta \in {\rm Dom}(Q_{\rm s})$. As $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ}$ is a core for $Q_{\rm s}$, there is a sequence $\{\eta_n\}$ in $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi\circ}$ such that

$$\eta_n \longrightarrow \eta, \quad Q_{\rm s}\eta_n \longrightarrow Q_{\rm s}\eta, \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty.$$

By (7.3)

$$Q_{\rm s}p'\eta_n = p'Q_{\rm s}\eta_n.$$

Letting $n \to \infty$, we have $p'\eta_n \longrightarrow p'\eta$ and $p'Q_{\rm s}\eta_n \longrightarrow p'Q_{\rm s}\eta$. Since $Q_{\rm s}$ is a closed operator,

$$p'\eta \in {\rm Dom}(Q_{\rm s}), \quad Q_{\rm s}p'\eta = p'Q_{\rm s}\eta.$$

Hence (7.1) is proved. □

8 Examples

We shall provide examples of supersymmetric C^*-dynamical systems for Case (I) and Case (II) satisfying all the assumptions stated in §2 §3. For each of them the existence of supersymmetric states in the sense of Definition 2.4 is shown.

8.1 Case (I); a class of supersymmetric fermion lattice models

We introduce a general class of supersymmetric fermion lattice models before going into a specific model. Take a ν-dimensional integer lattice $\mathbb{Z}^\nu$. For $x = (x_i),\ y = (x_i) \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$, let $|x - y| := \max\limits_{1\le i\le \nu} |x_i - y_i|$. For a subset ${\rm I} \subset \mathbb{Z}^\nu$, $|{\rm I}|$ denotes the number of sites in I. The notation '${\rm I} \Subset \mathbb{Z}^\nu$' means that ${\rm I} \subset \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ is finite, i.e. $|{\rm I}| < \infty$. For $l \in \mathbb{N}(\equiv \{1, 2, 3, 4, \cdots\})$, the cube centered at the origin $(0, 0, \ldots, 0) \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ with the edge length $2l$ is given as follows:

$${\rm C}_l := \{x \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu \ ; \ 0 \le |x_i| \le l,\ i = 1, \cdots, \nu\}. \tag{8.1}$$

Hence $|\mathrm{C}_l| = |2l+1|^{\nu}$.

Let a_i and a_i^* denote the fermion annihilation and creation operators at $i \in \mathbb{Z}^{\nu}$. The canonical anticommutation relations (CAR) are satisfied:

$$\begin{aligned} \{a_i^*, a_j\} &= \delta_{i,j}\,1, \\ \{a_i^*, a_j^*\} &= \{a_i, a_j\} = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{8.2}$$

where $\delta_{i,j} = 1$ if $i = j$, $\delta_{i,j} = 0$ if $i \neq j$. For simplicity we assume that there is a spinless fermion at each site. However, it is straightforward to extend our framework, at least formally, to the case of spin $\frac{1}{2}$-fermions which have spin-up and spin-down components.

For each $\mathrm{I} \Subset \mathbb{Z}^{\nu}$, the $*$-algebra generated by $\{a_i,\ a_i^*;\ i \in \mathrm{I}\}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I})$. If $\mathrm{I} \subset \mathrm{J} \Subset \mathbb{Z}^{\nu}$, $\mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I})$ is naturally imbedded to $\mathcal{F}(\mathrm{J})$ as its subalgebra. Let $\mathcal{A}_{\circ}$ be the $*$-algebra of all strictly local elements:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\circ} := \bigcup_{\mathrm{I} \Subset \mathbb{Z}^{\nu}} \mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I}). \tag{8.3}$$

The total system $\mathcal{F}$ is given by the C^*-completion of $\mathcal{A}_{\circ}$. The grading γ is the $\mathbb{Z}^2$-automorphism on $\mathcal{F}$ determined uniquely as

$$\gamma(a_i) = -a_i, \quad \gamma(a_i^*) = -a_i^*, \quad i \in \mathbb{Z}^{\nu}. \tag{8.4}$$

The even and odd parts of $\mathcal{F}$ are denoted by $\mathcal{F}^e$ and $\mathcal{F}^o$, and those of $\mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I})$ are denoted by $\mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I})^e$ and $\mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I})^o$. By (8.2) γ-locality holds:

$$[A,\ B]_{\gamma} = 0 \ \text{ for every }\ A \in \mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I}) \text{ and }\ B \in \mathcal{F}(\mathrm{J}) \ \text{ if }\ \mathrm{I} \cap \mathrm{J} = \emptyset, \tag{8.5}$$

where the graded commutator (2.2) is used. By using the graded commutator, the multiple graded commutators are defined as

$$\bigl[F,\ G\bigr]_{\gamma}^{(1)} := [F,\ G]_{\gamma}, \quad \bigl[F,\ G\bigr]_{\gamma}^{(n)} := \bigl[F,\ \bigl[F,\ G\bigr]_{\gamma}^{(n-1)}\bigr]_{\gamma} \quad \text{for } n \in \mathbb{N},\ n > 1, \quad F, G \in \mathcal{F} \tag{8.6}$$

We will see that in fermion lattice systems, a superderivation is given by 'local supercharges' (which will be precisely stated in what follows) in much the same way as a time-generator is given by local Hamiltonians [5, §6.2]. Let Ψ be a function on all finite subsets $\{\mathrm{I};\ \mathrm{I} \Subset \mathbb{Z}^{\nu}\}$ to strictly local elements such that

$$\Psi : \mathrm{I} \ \longmapsto \Psi(\mathrm{I}) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I})^o. \tag{8.7}$$

We call such Ψ an assignment of local supercharges. Assume further that Ψ has a finite range, namely there exists an $r \geq 0$ such that

$$\Psi(\mathrm{I}) = 0 \quad \text{if } \sup_{x,y \in \mathrm{I}} |x-y| > r. \tag{8.8}$$

The minimum non-negative integer r satisfying (8.8) is called the range of Ψ. For an assignment of local supercharges of finite range Ψ, define for every $\mathrm{I} \Subset \mathbb{Z}^\nu$

$$\widehat{C}_\Psi(\mathrm{I}) := \sum_{\mathrm{X}\cap\mathrm{I}\neq\emptyset, \mathrm{X}\Subset\mathbb{Z}^\nu} \Psi(\mathrm{X}) \in \mathcal{F}(\hat{\mathrm{I}}_r)^o, \tag{8.9}$$

where the summation is taken over all finite subsets $\{\mathrm{X}\}$ with non trivial intersection with I. By (8.7) (8.8), $\widehat{C}_\Psi(\mathrm{I})$ belongs to $\mathcal{F}(\hat{\mathrm{I}}_r)^o$, where $\hat{\mathrm{I}}_r$ is given by enlarging I as

$$\hat{\mathrm{I}}_r := \Big\{ x \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu \ ; \ \min_{y\in\mathrm{I}} |x-y| \le r \Big\}. \tag{8.10}$$

(By definition $\hat{\mathrm{I}}_0 = \mathrm{I}$.) This $\widehat{C}_\Psi(\mathrm{I})$ may be compared with

$$C_\Psi(\mathrm{I}) := \sum_{\mathrm{X}\subset\mathrm{I}} \Psi(\mathrm{X}) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I})^o,$$

where the summation is taken over all subsets in I.

For each $\mathrm{I} \Subset \mathbb{Z}^\nu$, let the infinitesimal supersymmetry transformation on $\mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I})$ be given as

$$\delta(A) := [\widehat{C}_\Psi(\mathrm{I}),\ A]_\gamma, \quad A \in \mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I}). \tag{8.11}$$

These for all finite subsets $\{\mathrm{I};\ \mathrm{I} \Subset \mathbb{Z}^\nu\}$ give a well-defined superderivation on $\mathcal{A}_\circ$, as the following consistency holds by (8.5) (8.9):

$$[\widehat{C}_\Psi(\mathrm{I}),\ A]_\gamma = [\widehat{C}_\Psi(\mathrm{J}),\ A]_\gamma \ \text{ for any } \ A \in \mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I}), \ \text{ if } \ \mathrm{I} \subset \mathrm{J} \Subset \mathbb{Z}^\nu.$$

We call the above δ given by (8.9) (8.11) the superderivation determined by Ψ.

Due to (2.6) (2.11) (2.12), the conjugate of δ is given as

$$\delta^*(A) = [\widehat{C}_{\Psi^*}(\mathrm{I}),\ A]_\gamma, \quad A \in \mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I}), \tag{8.12}$$

where Ψ^* is defined on $\{\mathrm{I};\ \mathrm{I} \Subset \mathbb{Z}^\nu\}$ as

$$\Psi^* : \mathrm{I} \ \longmapsto \Psi(\mathrm{I})^* \in \mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I})^o, \tag{8.13}$$

and $\widehat{C}_{\Psi^*}(\mathrm{I})$ is given by the formula (8.9) for Ψ^* (in place of Ψ), hence $\widehat{C}_{\Psi^*}(\mathrm{I}) = \widehat{C}_\Psi(\mathrm{I})^*$.

If $\Psi = \Psi^*$, namely

$$\Psi(\mathrm{I}) = \Psi(\mathrm{I})^* \ \text{ for any } \ \mathrm{I} \Subset \mathbb{Z}^\nu, \tag{8.14}$$

then Ψ is said to be hermitian.

For the symmetric superderivations $\delta_{\mathrm{s},1} = \delta + \delta^*$ and $\delta_{\mathrm{s},2} = i(\delta - \delta^*)$ (2.9),

$$\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}(A) = [\widehat{C}_{\Psi_{\mathrm{s},1}}(\mathrm{I}),\ A]_\gamma, \quad \delta_{\mathrm{s},2}(A) = [\widehat{C}_{\Psi_{\mathrm{s},2}}(\mathrm{I}),\ A]_\gamma, \quad A \in \mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I}), \tag{8.15}$$

where $\Psi_{\mathrm{s},1}$ and $\Psi_{\mathrm{s},2}$ are hermitian given as

$$\Psi_{\mathrm{s},1}(\mathrm{I}) := \Psi(\mathrm{I}) + \Psi(\mathrm{I})^* \in \mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I})^o, \quad \Psi_{\mathrm{s},2}(\mathrm{I}) := i(\Psi(\mathrm{I}) - \Psi(\mathrm{I})^*) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I})^o. \tag{8.16}$$

It is easy to see that Ψ^* has the same finite range r as that of Ψ (8.8), while $\Psi_{\mathrm{s},1}$ and $\Psi_{\mathrm{s},2}$ have their ranges equal or less than r. Hence for each $\mathrm{I} \Subset \mathbb{Z}^\nu$

$$\delta(\mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I})) \subset \mathcal{F}(\hat{\mathrm{I}}_r), \quad \delta^*(\mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I})) \subset \mathcal{F}(\hat{\mathrm{I}}_r), \tag{8.17}$$

and

$$\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}(\mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I})) \subset \mathcal{F}(\hat{\mathrm{I}}_r), \quad \delta_{\mathrm{s},2}(\mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I})) \subset \mathcal{F}(\hat{\mathrm{I}}_r). \tag{8.18}$$

So (3.9) (3.10) are satisfied. By (8.8)

$$\Psi(\mathrm{I}) = \Psi_{\mathrm{s},1}(\mathrm{I}) = \Psi_{\mathrm{s},2}(\mathrm{I}) = 0, \quad \text{if } |\mathrm{I}| > |\mathrm{C}_r| = r^\nu. \tag{8.19}$$

The uniform boundedness of Ψ is assumed:

$$\|\Psi\|_\infty := \sup_{\mathrm{I} \Subset \mathbb{Z}^\nu} \|\Psi(\mathrm{I})\| < \infty. \tag{8.20}$$

If $\|\Psi\|_\infty < \infty$, then by (8.16)

$$\|\Psi_{\mathrm{s},1}\|_\infty \le 2\|\Psi\|_\infty < \infty, \quad \|\Psi_{\mathrm{s},2}\|_\infty \le 2\|\Psi\|_\infty < \infty. \tag{8.21}$$

We *require* the nilpotent condition (3.11) in Definition 3.3 upon the above δ (determined by Ψ through the formulae (8.9) (8.11))

$$\delta \cdot \delta = \mathbf{0} \ \text{ on } \ \mathcal{A}_\circ. \tag{8.22}$$

The set of Ψ satisfying (8.7) (8.8) (8.20) and (8.22) (through (8.9) (8.11)) is denoted by $\mathscr{B}$. (We do not require the translation invariance for Ψ.)

For any $\Psi \in \mathscr{B}$, as in Definition 3.3 and Proposition 3.6, we can *define*

$$\delta_0 := \delta^* \cdot \delta + \delta \cdot \delta^* = \delta_{\mathrm{s},1} \cdot \delta_{\mathrm{s},1} = \delta_{\mathrm{s},2} \cdot \delta_{\mathrm{s},2} \ \text{ on } \ \mathcal{A}_\circ. \tag{8.23}$$

We call such δ_0 the $*$-derivation (or time-generator) determined by $\Psi \in \mathscr{B}$. The equalities in this formula is due to (8.22) as verified in Proposition 3.6. From (8.17) (8.18) (8.23),

$$\delta_0(\mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I})) \subset \mathcal{F}(\hat{\mathrm{I}}_{2r}). \tag{8.24}$$

So far δ, δ^*, $\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}$, $\delta_{\mathrm{s},2}$ and δ_0 are all defined on $\mathcal{A}_\circ$. Later in (8.55) (8.56) we will enlarge their domains to let them accord with the notation §2.

In the sequel we denote each of $\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}(\Psi_{\mathrm{s},1})$ and $\delta_{\mathrm{s},2}(\Psi_{\mathrm{s},2})$ simply by $\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(\Psi_{\mathrm{s}})$ dropping the subscript 1 or 2. We should nevertheless remind that $\Psi_{\rm s}$ does not mean a general hermitian assignment of local supercharges, rather, it is always related to the given $\Psi \in \mathscr{B}$ through (8.16); we start from $\Psi \in \mathscr{B}$ that gives δ satisfying the nilpotent condition (8.22) .

Remark 8.1. It is natural to ask how to characterize the assignments of local supercharges Ψ of a spinless fermion lattice system which give rise to a superderivation δ satisfying the nilpotent condition (8.22). What is the structure of $\mathscr{B}$? (It is not a linear space.) Those questions are naturally considered for spin$\frac{1}{2}$-fermion lattice systems as well.

Let us consider ${\delta_{\rm s}}^n \equiv \underbrace{\delta_{\rm s}\cdot\delta_{\rm s}\cdots\delta_{\rm s}}_{n\ \text{times}}$, the nth power of $\delta_{\rm s}$ with $n \in \mathbb{N}$. These are defined on $\mathcal{A}_\circ$ by (8.18). For any $A \in \mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I})$

$$
{\delta_{\rm s}}^n(A) = \sum_{\mathrm{X}_n\cap\mathrm{V}_{n-1}\neq\emptyset}\cdots\sum_{\mathrm{X}_2\cap\mathrm{V}_1\neq\emptyset}\ \sum_{\mathrm{X}_1\cap\mathrm{V}_0\neq\emptyset}\Big[\Psi_{\rm s}(\mathrm{X}_n),\ \cdots\Big[\Psi_{\rm s}(\mathrm{X}_2),\ \Big[\Psi_{\rm s}(\mathrm{X}_1),\ A\Big]_\gamma\Big]_\gamma\cdots\Big]_\gamma \in \mathcal{F}(\hat{\mathrm{I}}_{nr}), \tag{8.25}
$$

where

$$
\mathrm{V}_0 := \mathrm{I}, \quad \mathrm{V}_j := \mathrm{X}_j \cup \mathrm{X}_{j-1} \cup \cdots \cup \mathrm{X}_1 \cup \mathrm{V}_0. \tag{8.26}
$$

By taking (8.19) into account, we restrict non-trivial X_k $(1 \le k \le n)$ appeared in the summation of (8.25) and estimate $|V_j|$ as

$$
|\mathrm{V}_j| \le |\mathrm{I}| + j(|\mathrm{C}_r| - 1) \le |\mathrm{I}| + j\cdot r^\nu. \tag{8.27}
$$

Note that the graded commutators of $\Psi_{\rm s}(\mathrm{X})$ with any element of $\mathcal{F}(\mathrm{Y})$ vanishes if $\mathrm{X}\cap\mathrm{Y} = \emptyset$ by the γ-locality (8.5). So (8.25) is equivalently written as

$$
\begin{aligned}
{\delta_{\rm s}}^n(A) &= \sum_{\mathrm{X}_n,\cdots\mathrm{X}_2,\mathrm{X}_1\subset\mathrm{J}}\Big[\Psi_{\rm s}(\mathrm{X}_n),\ \cdots\Big[\Psi_{\rm s}(\mathrm{X}_2),\ \Big[\Psi_{\rm s}(\mathrm{X}_1),\ A\Big]_\gamma\Big]_\gamma\cdots\Big]_\gamma \\
&= \Big[\sum_{\mathrm{X}\subset\mathrm{J}}\Psi_{\rm s}(X),\ A\Big]_\gamma^{(n)},
\end{aligned} \tag{8.28}
$$

where J is any subset such that $\mathrm{J} \supset \hat{\mathrm{I}}_{nr}$ (for example $\mathrm{J} = \mathbb{Z}^\nu$) by noting (8.18). By $\delta_0 = \delta_{\rm s}^2$ on $\mathcal{A}_\circ$, it follows from (8.25) (8.28) that for any $A \in \mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I})$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
{\delta_0}^n(A) &= \sum_{\mathrm{X}_{2n}\cap\mathrm{V}_{2n-1}\neq\emptyset}\cdots\sum_{\mathrm{X}_2\cap\mathrm{V}_1\neq\emptyset}\ \sum_{\mathrm{X}_1\cap\mathrm{V}_0\neq\emptyset}\Big[\Psi_{\rm s}(\mathrm{X}_{2n}),\ \cdots\Big[\Psi_{\rm s}(\mathrm{X}_2),\ \Big[\Psi_{\rm s}(\mathrm{X}_1),\ A\Big]_\gamma\Big]_\gamma\cdots\Big]_\gamma \\
&= \Big[\sum_{\mathrm{X}\subset\mathrm{J}}\Psi_{\rm s}(X),\ A\Big]_\gamma^{(2n)} \in \mathcal{F}(\hat{\mathrm{I}}_{2nr}),
\end{aligned} \tag{8.29}
$$

where J is any subset that includes $\hat{\mathrm{I}}_{2nr}$.

Define the bounded superderivations indexed by finite subsets $\Lambda \Subset \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ by the same formula as (8.15) but now on the total system $\mathcal{F}$ as

$$
\delta_{{\rm s},\Lambda}(F) := [\widehat{C}_{\Psi_{\rm s}}(\Lambda),\ F]_\gamma\ \Big(= \sum_{\mathrm{X}\cap\Lambda\neq\emptyset}[\Psi_{\rm s}(\mathrm{X}),\ F]_\gamma\Big) \quad \text{for every} \quad F \in \mathcal{F}. \tag{8.30}
$$

By definition, if $\Lambda \supset \mathrm{I}$, then

$$\delta_{\mathrm{s},\Lambda}(A) = \delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A) \quad \text{for each} \quad A \in \mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I}).$$

Hence for each $A \in \mathcal{A}_\circ$

$$\lim_{\Lambda \to \infty} \delta_{\mathrm{s},\Lambda}(A) = \delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A),$$

where the limit means that $\{\Lambda;\ \Lambda \Subset \mathbb{Z}^\nu\}$ tends to the whole $\mathbb{Z}^\nu$, i.e. it eventually includes every finite subset.

For each $\Lambda \Subset \mathbb{Z}^\nu$, give the following bounded $*$-derivation[12] on $\mathcal{F}$:

$$\delta_{0,\Lambda}(F) := \delta_{\mathrm{s},\Lambda} \cdot \delta_{\mathrm{s},\Lambda}(F) \quad \text{for} \quad F \in \mathcal{F}. \tag{8.31}$$

It is written in terms of Ψ_{s} as

$$\delta_{0,\Lambda}(F) = \sum_{\mathrm{X}_2 \cap \Lambda \neq \emptyset,\ \mathrm{X}_1 \cap \Lambda \neq \emptyset} \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2),\ \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1),\ F\Big]_\gamma\Big]_\gamma = \sum_{\mathrm{X}_2, \mathrm{X}_1 \subset \hat{\Lambda}_r} \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2),\ \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1),\ F\Big]_\gamma\Big]_\gamma \tag{8.32}$$

Similarly, ${\delta_{0,\Lambda}}^{n} \equiv \underbrace{\delta_{0,\Lambda} \cdot \delta_{0,\Lambda} \cdots \delta_{0,\Lambda}}_{n \text{ times}}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ defined on $\mathcal{F}$ has the following expression:

$$\begin{aligned}
&{\delta_{0,\Lambda}}^{n}(F) \\
&= \sum_{\mathrm{X}_{2n}, \cdots, \mathrm{X}_2, \mathrm{X}_1 \subset \hat{\Lambda}_r} \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_{2n}),\ \cdots \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2),\ \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1),\ F\Big]_\gamma\Big]_\gamma \cdots\Big]_\gamma \\
&= \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{X}_{2n} \cap \mathrm{V}_{2n-1} \neq \emptyset \\ \mathrm{X}_{2n} \subset \hat{\Lambda}_r}} \cdots \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{X}_2 \cap \mathrm{V}_1 \neq \emptyset \\ \mathrm{X}_2 \subset \hat{\Lambda}_r}} \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{X}_1 \cap \mathrm{V}_0 \neq \emptyset \\ \mathrm{X}_1 \subset \hat{\Lambda}_r}} \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_{2n}), \cdots \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2),\ \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1),\ F\Big]_\gamma\Big]_\gamma \cdots\Big]_\gamma \\
&= \Big[\sum_{\mathrm{X} \subset \hat{\Lambda}_r} \Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(X),\ A\Big]_\gamma^{(2n)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{8.33}$$

Therefore for any $A \in \mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I})$,

$${\delta_{0,\Lambda}}^{n}(A) \in \mathcal{F}(\hat{\mathrm{I}}_{2nr}) \cap \mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I} \cup \hat{\Lambda}_r). \tag{8.34}$$

For any fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $A \in \mathcal{A}_\circ$, by comparing (8.33) with (8.29) there is a sufficiently large Λ_0 such that for any $\Lambda \supset \Lambda_0$

$${\delta_{0,\Lambda}}^{k}(A) = {\delta_0}^{k}(A), \quad k = 1,\ 2,\ \cdots, n-1,\ n.$$

Obviously for each $A \in \mathcal{A}_\circ$

$$\lim_{\Lambda \to \infty} \delta_{0,\Lambda}(A) = \delta_0(A). \tag{8.35}$$

---

[12] On $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ $\delta_{0,\Lambda}$ is not identical to δ_0 due to the difference of *surface terms.*

Let

$$\alpha_t^{\Lambda}(F) := e^{it\delta_{0,\Lambda}}(F) \quad \text{for} \quad F \in \mathcal{F}, \tag{8.36}$$

which is an inner one-parameter group of $*$-automorphisms of $\mathcal{F}$. It is explicitly given by the uniform convergence series with respect to $t \in \mathbb{R}$ in any compact subset of $\mathbb{R}$:

$$\alpha_t^{\Lambda}(F) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} F_n^{\Lambda} t^n, \quad F_0^{\Lambda} := F, \; F_n^{\Lambda} := \frac{(i)^n}{n!} \delta_{0,\Lambda}^{\;n}(F) \in \mathcal{F} \;\; \text{for } n \geq 1. \tag{8.37}$$

Obviously for each $A \in \mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I})$,

$$\alpha_t^{\Lambda}(A) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I} \cup \hat{\Lambda}_r). \tag{8.38}$$

Lemma 8.2. *Assume the supersymmetric C^*-dynamics of a fermion lattice system given in this subsection. Let $\Psi \in \mathscr{B}$ whose range is r, and let Ψ_{s} denote its symmetrized one given as* (8.16)*. Let δ_0 denote the $*$-derivation on $\mathcal{A}_\circ$ determined by $\Psi \in \mathscr{B}$. Let $\delta_{0,\Lambda}$ with $\Lambda \Subset \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ denote the bounded $*$-derivation on $\mathcal{F}$ given as* (8.31)*. Then for each $F \in \mathcal{F}$,*

$$\delta_{0,\Lambda}(F) = \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{X}_2 \cap \mathrm{X}_1 \neq \emptyset \\ \mathrm{X}_2, \mathrm{X}_1 \subset \hat{\Lambda}_r}} \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2)\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1), \; F \Big], \tag{8.39}$$

and for each $A \in \mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I})$,

$$\delta_{0,\Lambda}(A) = \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{X}_2 \cap \mathrm{X}_1 \neq \emptyset \\ \mathrm{X}_2, \mathrm{X}_1 \subset \hat{\Lambda}_r}} \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2)\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1), \; A \Big] = \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{X}_2 \cap \mathrm{X}_1 \neq \emptyset \\ \mathrm{X}_2, \mathrm{X}_1 \subset \hat{\Lambda}_r \\ (\mathrm{X}_2 \cup \mathrm{X}_1) \cap \mathrm{I} \neq \emptyset}} \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2)\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1), \; A \Big]. \tag{8.40}$$

For each $A \in \mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I})$,

$$\delta_0(A) = \sum_{\mathrm{X}_2 \cap \mathrm{X}_1 \neq \emptyset} \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2)\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1), \; A \Big] = \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{X}_2 \cap \mathrm{X}_1 \neq \emptyset \\ (\mathrm{X}_2 \cup \mathrm{X}_1) \cap \mathrm{I} \neq \emptyset}} \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2)\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1), \; A \Big]. \tag{8.41}$$

Proof. For $F = F_+ + F_-$ with $F_+ := \frac{1}{2}(F + \gamma(F)) \in \mathcal{F}^e$, $F_- := \frac{1}{2}(F - \gamma(F)) \in \mathcal{F}^o$, it follows from (8.32) that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \delta_{0,\Lambda}(F) \\
= \ & \delta_{0,\Lambda}(F_+) + \delta_{0,\Lambda}(F_-) \\
= \ & \sum_{\mathrm{X}_2,\mathrm{X}_1 \subset \hat{\Lambda}_r} \Big\{ \Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2),\ \ \Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1) F_+ - F_+ \Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1) \Big\} + \sum_{\mathrm{X}_2,\mathrm{X}_1 \subset \hat{\Lambda}_r} \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2),\ \Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1) F_- + F_- \Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1) \Big] \\
= \ & \sum_{\mathrm{X}_2,\mathrm{X}_1 \subset \hat{\Lambda}_r} \Big(\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2)\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1) F_+ + \Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1) F_+ \Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2) - \Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2) F_+ \Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1) - F_+ \Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1)\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2) + \\
& + \Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2)\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1) F_- - \Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1) F_- \Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2) + \Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2) F_- \Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1) - F_- \Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1)\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2) \Big) \\
= \ & \sum_{\mathrm{X}_2,\mathrm{X}_1 \subset \hat{\Lambda}_r} \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2)\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1),\ F_+ + F_- \Big] \\
= \ & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathrm{X}_2,\mathrm{X}_1 \subset \hat{\Lambda}_r} \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2)\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1) + \Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1)\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2),\ F \Big] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathrm{X}_2,\mathrm{X}_1 \subset \hat{\Lambda}_r} \Big[\big\{ \Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2),\ \Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1) \big\},\ F \Big] \\
= \ & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{X}_2,\mathrm{X}_1 \subset \hat{\Lambda}_r \\ \mathrm{X}_2 \cap \mathrm{X}_1 \neq \emptyset}} \Big[\big\{ \Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2),\ \Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1) \big\},\ F \Big] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{X}_2,\mathrm{X}_1 \subset \hat{\Lambda}_r \\ \mathrm{X}_2 \cap \mathrm{X}_1 \neq \emptyset}} \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2)\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1) + \Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1)\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2),\ F \Big] \\
= \ & \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{X}_2,\mathrm{X}_1 \subset \hat{\Lambda}_r \\ \mathrm{X}_2 \cap \mathrm{X}_1 \neq \emptyset}} \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2)\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1),\ F \Big], \qquad (8.42)
\end{aligned}
$$

where we noted that $\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathrm{X})^o$ and $\{\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2),\ \Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1)\} = 0$ if $\mathrm{X}_2 \cap \mathrm{X}_1 = \emptyset$. Thus (8.39) is shown. (8.40) is an immediate consequence of (8.39). To show (8.41), we repeat the same derivation as in (8.42) just dropping the restriction '$\mathrm{X}_2, \mathrm{X}_1 \subset \hat{\Lambda}_r$' for the summation. (Note that in the above, the nilpotent condition (8.22) is not used.) ☐

The following would be useful to check the nilpotent condition (8.22) of δ.

Lemma 8.3. *Assume the supersymmetric C^*-dynamics of a fermion lattice system given in this subsection. Let $\Psi \in \mathscr{B}$ whose range is r, and let δ denote the superderivation on $\mathcal{A}_\circ$ determined by Ψ. Then for each $A \in \mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I})$,*

$$
\delta \cdot \delta(A) = \sum_{\mathrm{X}_2 \cap \mathrm{X}_1 \neq \emptyset} \Big[\Psi(\mathrm{X}_2)\Psi(\mathrm{X}_1),\ A \Big] = \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{X}_2 \cap \mathrm{X}_1 \neq \emptyset \\ (\mathrm{X}_2 \cup \mathrm{X}_1) \cap \mathrm{I} \neq \emptyset}} \Big[\Psi(\mathrm{X}_2)\Psi(\mathrm{X}_1),\ A \Big] \in \mathcal{F}(\hat{\mathrm{I}}_{2r}). \quad (8.43)
$$

Proof. Seeing the proof of Lemma 8.2, we just have to replace Ψ_{s} in the right-hand side of (8.41) by Ψ to obtain (8.43). ☐

Lemma 8.4. *Assume the supersymmetric C^*-dynamics of a fermion lattice system given in this subsection. Let $\Psi \in \mathscr{B}$ and let r be its range. Then for each $A \in \mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I})$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$
\frac{1}{n!} \|\delta_{0,\Lambda}{}^n(A)\| \quad \leq \quad \|A\| \cdot \exp\Big(4|\mathrm{I}| \cdot L_{\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}}\Big) \cdot M_{\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}}{}^n, \qquad (8.44)
$$

and

$$\frac{1}{n!}\|{\delta_0}^n(A)\| \leq \|A\| \cdot \exp\Big(4|\mathrm{I}| \cdot L_{\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}}\Big) \cdot {M_{\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}}}^n, \tag{8.45}$$

where

$$L_{\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}} := \sup_{i\in\mathbb{Z}^\nu} \sum_{\mathrm{Y};\mathrm{Y}\cap\mathrm{X}\neq\emptyset} \sum_{\mathrm{X}\ni i} \|\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{Y})\| \cdot \|\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X})\|, \quad M_{\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}} := \exp\Big(8r^\nu L_{\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}}\Big). \tag{8.46}$$

Proof. As Ψ_{s} is uniformly bounded and of finite range, $L_{\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}}$ is finite. In fact,

$$\begin{aligned} |L_{\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}}| &\leq \sup_{i\in\mathbb{Z}^\nu} \sum_{\mathrm{Y};\,\mathrm{Y}\cap\mathrm{X}\neq\emptyset} \ \sum_{\mathrm{X};\,\mathrm{X}\ni i,\,\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X})\neq 0} \|\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}\|_\infty \cdot \|\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}\|_\infty \\ &\leq \sup_{i\in\mathbb{Z}^\nu} \left|2^{\{\mathrm{Y};\,\mathrm{Y}\cap\mathrm{X}\neq\emptyset\}}\right| \cdot \left|2^{\{\mathrm{X};\,\mathrm{X}\ni i,\,|\mathrm{X}|\leq|\mathrm{C}_r|\}}\right| \cdot \|\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}\|_\infty^2 \\ &\leq (2^{|\mathrm{C}_{2r}|} \cdot |\mathrm{C}_r|) \cdot 2^{|\mathrm{C}_{2r}|} \cdot \|\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}\|_\infty^2 \leq 2^{2|\mathrm{C}_{2r}|} \cdot |\mathrm{C}_r| \cdot (2\|\Psi\|_\infty)^2 \\ &= 4^{(2r+1)^\nu+1} \cdot (r+1)^\nu \cdot \|\Psi\|_\infty^2. \end{aligned} \tag{8.47}$$

The above estimate comes from the following observation. For any fixed $i \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu$, as the range of Ψ_{s} is equal or less than r, every X such that $\mathrm{X} \ni i$ and $\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}) \neq 0$ is included in $\mathrm{C}_{2r} + i$, the ν-dimensional cube centered at i with its edge-length $2r$. Hence the number of such $\{\mathrm{X}\}$ is estimated by $2^{|\mathrm{C}_{2r}+i|} = 2^{|\mathrm{C}_{2r}|}$. Fix such X. By (8.19) $|\mathrm{X}| \leq |\mathrm{C}_r|$. Take an arbitrary $j \in \mathrm{X}$. Then there are at most $2^{|\mathrm{C}_{2r}|}$ subsets Y satisfying $\mathrm{Y} \ni j$ and $\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{Y}) \neq 0$. Hence the summation over Y is estimated by the multiplication of $2^{|\mathrm{C}_{2r}|} \cdot |\mathrm{C}_r|$.

By (8.40) in Lemma 8.2,

$$\begin{aligned} &{\delta_{0,\Lambda}}^n(A) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{X}_{2n}\cap\mathrm{X}_{2n-1}\neq\emptyset,\cdots,\mathrm{X}_2\cap\mathrm{X}_1\neq\emptyset \\ \mathrm{X}_{2n},\mathrm{X}_{2n-1},\cdots,\mathrm{X}_2,\mathrm{X}_1\subset\hat{\Lambda}_r}} \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_{2n})\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_{2n-1}),\ \cdots\Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_4)\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_3),\ \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2)\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1),\ A\Big]\Big]\cdots\Big] \\ &= \sum_{\substack{(\mathrm{X}_{2n}\cup\mathrm{X}_{2n-1})\cap\mathrm{V}_{2n-2}\neq\emptyset \\ \mathrm{X}_{2n}\cap\mathrm{X}_{2n-1}\neq\emptyset \\ (\mathrm{X}_{2n}\cup\mathrm{X}_{2n-1})\subset\hat{\Lambda}_r}} \cdots \sum_{\substack{(\mathrm{X}_2\cup\mathrm{X}_1)\cap\mathrm{V}_0\neq\emptyset \\ \mathrm{X}_2\cap\mathrm{X}_1\neq\emptyset \\ (\mathrm{X}_2\cup\mathrm{X}_1)\subset\hat{\Lambda}_r}} \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_{2n})\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_{2n-1}),\ \cdots\Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_4)\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_3),\ \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2)\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1),\ A\Big]\Big]\Big], \end{aligned} \tag{8.48}$$

similarly by (8.41)

$$\begin{aligned} &{\delta_0}^n(A) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{(\mathrm{X}_{2n}\cup\mathrm{X}_{2n-1})\cap\mathrm{V}_{2n-2}\neq\emptyset \\ \mathrm{X}_{2n}\cap\mathrm{X}_{2n-1}\neq\emptyset}} \cdots \sum_{\substack{(\mathrm{X}_2\cup\mathrm{X}_1)\cap\mathrm{V}_0\neq\emptyset \\ \mathrm{X}_2\cap\mathrm{X}_1\neq\emptyset}} \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_{2n})\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_{2n-1}),\ \cdots\Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_4)\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_3),\ \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2)\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1),\ A\Big]\Big]\Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{8.49}$$

By taking away the restriction $\mathrm{X}_{2n}, \mathrm{X}_{2n-1}, \cdots, \mathrm{X}_2, \mathrm{X}_1 \subset \hat{\Lambda}_r$ for the summation of (8.48), we deduce the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\delta_{0,\Lambda}^{\,n}(A)\| \\
\leq\;& 2^n\|A\|\cdot\prod_{k=0}^{n-1}\Big\{\sum_{\mathrm{X}_{2k+2};\,\mathrm{X}_{2k+2}\cap\mathrm{X}_{2k+1}\neq\emptyset}\;\sum_{\mathrm{X}_{2k+1};\,\mathrm{X}_{2k+1}\cap\mathrm{V}_{2k}\neq\emptyset}\|\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_{2k+2})\|\cdot\|\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_{2k+1})\| \\
&\quad+\sum_{\mathrm{X}_{2k+1};\,\mathrm{X}_{2k+1}\cap\mathrm{X}_{2k+2}\neq\emptyset}\;\sum_{\mathrm{X}_{2k+2};\,\mathrm{X}_{2k+2}\cap\mathrm{V}_{2k}\neq\emptyset}\|\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_{2k+2})\|\cdot\|\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_{2k+1})\|\Big\} \\
\leq\;& 2^n\|A\|\cdot\prod_{k=0}^{n-1}|\mathrm{V}_{2k}|\cdot\Big\{\sup_{i\in\mathrm{V}_{2k}}\sum_{\mathrm{X}_{2k+2};\,\mathrm{X}_{2k+2}\cap\mathrm{X}_{2k+1}\neq\emptyset}\;\sum_{\mathrm{X}_{2k+1}\ni i}\|\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_{2k+2})\|\cdot\|\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_{2k+1})\| \\
&\quad+\sup_{j\in\mathrm{V}_{2k}}\sum_{\mathrm{X}_{2k+1};\,\mathrm{X}_{2k+1}\cap\mathrm{X}_{2k+2}\neq\emptyset}\;\sum_{\mathrm{X}_{2k+2}\ni j}\|\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_{2k+2})\|\cdot\|\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_{2k+1})\|\Big\} \\
\leq\;& 2^n\|A\|\cdot\prod_{k=0}^{n-1}|\mathrm{V}_{2k}|\cdot\Big\{\sup_{i\in\mathbb{Z}^\nu}\sum_{\mathrm{X}_{2k+2};\,\mathrm{X}_{2k+2}\cap\mathrm{X}_{2k+1}\neq\emptyset}\;\sum_{\mathrm{X}_{2k+1}\ni i}\|\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_{2k+2})\|\cdot\|\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_{2k+1})\| \\
&\quad+\sup_{j\in\mathbb{Z}^\nu}\sum_{\mathrm{X}_{2k+1};\,\mathrm{X}_{2k+1}\cap\mathrm{X}_{2k+2}\neq\emptyset}\;\sum_{\mathrm{X}_{2k+2}\ni j}\|\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_{2k+2})\|\cdot\|\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_{2k+1})\|\Big\} \\
\leq\;& 2^n\|A\|\cdot\prod_{k=0}^{n-1}\big(|\mathrm{V}_{2k}|\cdot\{2L_{\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}}\}\big)\leq 2^n\|A\|\cdot\big(|\mathrm{V}_{2(n-1)}|^n\cdot 2^n{L_{\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}}}^n\big) \\
\leq\;& 4^n\|A\|\cdot(|\mathrm{I}|+(2n-1)\cdot r^\nu)^n\cdot{L_{\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}}}^n. \qquad (8.50)
\end{aligned}$$

From (8.49) we deduce in much the same way

$$\|{\delta_0}^n(A)\|\leq 4^n\|A\|\cdot(|\mathrm{I}|+(2n-1)\cdot r^\nu)^n\cdot{L_{\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}}}^n. \qquad (8.51)$$

We have further

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{n!}\Big(4^n\cdot(|\mathrm{I}|+(2n-1)\cdot r^\nu)^n\cdot{L_{\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}}}^n\Big)\leq\frac{1}{n!}\Big(4\cdot(|\mathrm{I}|+2n\cdot r^\nu)\cdot L_{\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}}\Big)^n \\
\leq\;&\exp\Big(4\cdot(|\mathrm{I}|+2n\cdot r^\nu)\cdot L_{\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}}\Big)=\exp\Big(4|\mathrm{I}|\cdot L_{\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}}\Big)\cdot\exp\Big(n\cdot(8r^\nu L_{\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}})\Big), \qquad (8.52)
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality $\frac{x^n}{n!}\leq e^x$ for $x\geq 0$ is used. Substituting the estimate (8.52) into (8.50) and to (8.51), we obtain (8.44) (8.45) with (8.46). ☐

Note that the estimate (8.44) is independent of Λ.

Proposition 8.5. *Assume the supersymmetric C^*-dynamics of a fermion lattice system given in this subsection. Let $\Psi\in\mathscr{B}$. Let δ_0 denote the $*$-derivation on $\mathcal{A}_\circ$ determined by Ψ. Then δ_0 is a pre-generator of the strongly continuous one parameter group of $*$-automorphisms α_t on $\mathcal{F}$ which is given by*

$$\Big\|\lim_{\Lambda\to\infty}\alpha_t^\Lambda(F)-\alpha_t(F)\Big\|=0 \;\text{ for each }\; F\in\mathcal{F}, \qquad (8.53)$$

where α_t^Λ denotes the one parameter group of (inner) $*$-automorphisms (8.36)*, and the* *convergence is uniform for $t \in \mathbb{R}$ in any compact subset of $\mathbb{R}$. (Namely, the closure of δ_0 with respect to the C^*-norm is the generator of α_t defined above.)*

Proof. Let us recall (8.35), i.e. $\lim_{\Lambda\to\infty}\delta_{0,\Lambda}(A) = \delta_0(A)$ for each $A \in \mathcal{A}_\circ$. Hence to prove the statement it is enough to show that every element in $\mathcal{A}_\circ$ is analytic for δ_0 by using the argument given in [5, Prop.6.2.3. Th.6.2.4]. Let $A \in \mathcal{A}_\circ$ and let I be the least finite subset of $\mathbb{Z}^\nu$ such that $A \in \mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I})$. Take

$$t_0 := \frac{1}{M_{\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}}}. \tag{8.54}$$

By (8.45) $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{|t|^n}{n!}\left\|{\delta_0}^n(A)\right\|$ is estimated by $\|A\|\cdot e^{4|\mathrm{I}|\cdot L_{\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}}}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\left|\frac{t}{t_0}\right|^n$, which is finite for $|t| < t_0$. Hence we have shown that A is an analytic element of δ_0. □

The next statement is not restricted to fermion lattice systems. Rather, it is given under a very general setting.

Proposition 8.6. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a unital graded C^*-algebra with its grading γ. Let $\mathcal{A}_\circ$ be a norm dense unital γ-invariant $*$-subalgebra of $\mathcal{F}$. Let δ be a superderivation whose domain includes $\mathcal{A}_\circ$. Suppose that there exists a supersymmetric state φ on $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to δ in the sense of Definition 2.4. Suppose further that the GNS representation $\left(\pi_\varphi,\ \mathscr{H}_\varphi,\ \Omega_\varphi\right)$ of φ is faithful (one-to-one). Then $\delta|_{\mathcal{A}_\circ}$ is closable in the norm of $\mathcal{F}$.*

Proof. Let $\{A_n \in \mathcal{A}_\circ\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence such that

$$A_n \longrightarrow 0 \ \text{ and } \ \delta(A_n) \longrightarrow D \in \mathcal{F} \ \text{ in norm as } n \to \infty.$$

For every $B, C \in \mathcal{A}_\circ$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\pi_\varphi(C)\Omega_\varphi,\ \pi_\varphi(D)\pi_\varphi(B)\Omega_\varphi) \\
= & \lim_{n\to\infty}\big(\pi_\varphi(C)\Omega_\varphi,\ \pi_\varphi\big(\delta(A_n)\big)\pi_\varphi(B)\Omega_\varphi\big) \\
= & \lim_{n\to\infty}(\pi_\varphi(C)\Omega_\varphi,\ Q\pi_\varphi(A_n)\pi_\varphi(B)\Omega_\varphi) - \lim_{n\to\infty}(\pi_\varphi(C)\Omega_\varphi,\ \pi_\varphi(\gamma(A_n))Q\pi_\varphi(B)\Omega_\varphi) \\
= & \ 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have noted (4.4), and $A_n \to 0$, $\gamma(A_n) \to 0$ in norm. As $\pi_\varphi(\mathcal{A}_\circ)\Omega_\varphi$ is dense in $\mathscr{H}_\varphi$, this implies $\pi_\varphi(D) = 0$. As π_φ is faithful, we have $D = 0$. This yields the statement. □

Proposition 8.7. *Assume the supersymmetric C^*-dynamics of a fermion lattice system given in this subsection. Let δ denote the superderivation determined by $\Psi \in \mathscr{B}$ on $\mathcal{A}_\circ$. Suppose that there exists a supersymmetric state φ with respect to δ in the sense of Definition 2.4. Then δ and the corresponding δ_{s} (defined on $\mathcal{A}_\circ$ by (8.15)) are closable in norm.*

Proof. The total system $\mathcal{F}$ is now a CAR algebra and it is known to be simple (i.e. it has no non-trivial ideal). Therefore any non-zero representation of $\mathcal{F}$ is faithful, and so the GNS representation $\big(\pi_\varphi,\ \mathscr{H}_\varphi,\ \Omega_\varphi\big)$ for φ is. As the assumption of Proposition 8.6 is satisfied, δ is closable in norm. As φ is invariant under $\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(=\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}$ or $\delta_{\mathrm{s},2})$ as well, the closability of δ_{s} holds. ☐

We will denote the norm closure of δ_0 (given originally on $\mathcal{A}_\circ$ as (8.23)) by the same notation 'δ_0':

$$\delta_0 = \overline{\delta_0|_{\mathcal{A}_\circ}}. \tag{8.55}$$

Namely δ_0 is exactly the generator of α_t by Proposition 8.5 satisfying (3.2) (3.7) of the standing assumptions for Case (I) in § 2. From now until the end of this subsection, we always suppose the existence of a supersymmetric state to assure the closability of the superderivations δ and δ_{s}. Taking the norm closure of the pre-closed superderivations δ and δ_{s} defined on $\mathcal{A}_\circ$, we redefine them as

$$\delta = \overline{\delta|_{\mathcal{A}_\circ}},\ \delta_{\mathrm{s}} = \overline{\delta_{\mathrm{s}}|_{\mathcal{A}_\circ}}, \quad \mathcal{D}_\delta = \mathcal{D}_{\delta^*} = \mathcal{D}_{\delta_{\mathrm{s}}}. \tag{8.56}$$

By (8.56), the standing assumptions (3.7) (3.8) in §2 are assured. (Let us refer to Remark 3.2.)

Remark 8.8. In the proof of Proposition 8.7, the assumption 'unbroken supersymmetry' is essential. This not only restricts the statement very much, but also seems to be artificial. We expect that this assumption could be dropped by making better use of special properties of δ in the present setting of the fermion lattice system rather than relying naively on Proposition 8.6 which is a general result without detailed assumptions. Namely, our conjecture is the following statement: *Assume the supersymmetric C^*-dynamics of a fermion lattice system given in this subsection. Let δ denote the superderivation determined by $\Psi \in \mathscr{B}$ on $\mathcal{A}_\circ$. Then δ is closable in norm.* (We further expect that the nilpotent condition of δ (8.22) would be unnecessary to show the closability of δ.) On the assumption of unbroken supersymmetry, a similar remark will apply to the next Proposition 8.9.

Proposition 8.9. *Assume the supersymmetric C^*-dynamics of a fermion lattice system given in this subsection. Suppose that there exists a supersymmetric state φ (in the sense of Definition* 2.4*) with respect to the superderivation δ determined by $\Psi \in \mathscr{B}$. Then*

$$\alpha_t(\mathcal{A}_\circ) \subset \mathcal{D}_{\delta_{\mathrm{s}}}, \quad \delta_{\mathrm{s}} \cdot \alpha_t = \alpha_t \cdot \delta_{\mathrm{s}} \ \ \text{on } \mathcal{A}_\circ \ \ \text{for each } t \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{8.57}$$

Similarly,

$$\alpha_t(\mathcal{A}_\circ) \subset \mathcal{D}_{\delta}, \quad \delta \cdot \alpha_t = \alpha_t \cdot \delta \ \ \text{on } \mathcal{A}_\circ \ \ \text{for each } t \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{8.58}$$

Proof. We first show the statement for $|t| < t_0$, t_0 being defined as (8.54). Let $A \in \mathcal{A}_\circ$ and let I be the least finite subset of $\mathbb{Z}^\nu$ such that $A \in \mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I})$. By Proposition 8.7, for an arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a sufficiently large $\Lambda_0 \Subset \mathbb{Z}^\nu$ such that $\Lambda_0 \supset \mathrm{I}$ and

$$\left\| \alpha_t^{\Lambda}(A) - \alpha_t(A) \right\| < \varepsilon \ \text{ for any } \ \Lambda \supset \Lambda_0. \tag{8.59}$$

As $\delta_{0,\Lambda}^{\,n}(A)$ and $\alpha_t^{\Lambda}(A)$ are in $\mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I} \cup \hat{\Lambda}_r) \subset \mathcal{A}_\circ$ (8.34) (8.38), δ_{s} can be defined on each of them. From (8.33) we have for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\delta_{\mathrm{s}}\big(\delta_{0,\Lambda}^{\,n}(A)\big) \\
= \ & \delta_{\mathrm{s}}\left(\sum_{\mathrm{X}_{2n},\cdots,\mathrm{X}_2,\mathrm{X}_1 \subset \hat{\Lambda}_r} \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_{2n}),\ \cdots \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2),\ \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1),\ A\Big]_\gamma\Big]_\gamma \cdots \Big]_\gamma \right) \\
= \ & \sum_{\mathrm{X}} \ \sum_{\mathrm{X}_{2n},\cdots,\mathrm{X}_2,\mathrm{X}_1 \subset \hat{\Lambda}_r} \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}),\ \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_{2n}),\ \cdots \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2),\ \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1),\ A\Big]_\gamma\Big]_\gamma \cdots \Big]_\gamma\Big]_\gamma \\
= \ & \sum_{\mathrm{X} \cap \hat{\Lambda}_r \neq \emptyset} \ \sum_{\mathrm{X}_{2n},\cdots,\mathrm{X}_2,\mathrm{X}_1 \subset \hat{\Lambda}_r} \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}),\ \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_{2n}),\ \cdots \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2),\ \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1),\ A\Big]_\gamma\Big]_\gamma \cdots \Big]_\gamma\Big]_\gamma \\
= \ & \sum_{\mathrm{X} \cap \hat{\Lambda}_r \neq \emptyset} \ \sum_{\mathrm{X}_{2n},\cdots,\mathrm{X}_2 \subset \hat{\Lambda}_r} \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}),\ \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_{2n}),\ \cdots \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2),\ \delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\Big]_\gamma \cdots \Big]_\gamma\Big]_\gamma \\
= \ & \sum_{\mathrm{X} \subset \hat{\Lambda}_r} \ \sum_{\mathrm{X}_{2n},\cdots,\mathrm{X}_2 \subset \hat{\Lambda}_r} \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}),\ \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_{2n}),\ \cdots \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2),\ \delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\Big]_\gamma \cdots \Big]_\gamma\Big]_\gamma \\
& \quad + \sum_{\mathrm{X} \not\subset \hat{\Lambda}_r} \ \sum_{\mathrm{X}_{2n},\cdots,\mathrm{X}_2 \subset \hat{\Lambda}_r} \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}),\ \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_{2n}),\ \cdots \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2),\ \delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\Big]_\gamma \cdots \Big]_\gamma\Big]_\gamma \\
= \ & \delta_{0,\Lambda}^{\,n}\big(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\big) + a_n^{\Lambda},
\end{aligned} \tag{8.60}$$

where we used $\displaystyle\sum_{\mathrm{X}_1 \subset \hat{\Lambda}_r} \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1),\ A\Big]_\gamma = \sum_{\mathrm{X}_1} \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_1),\ A\Big]_\gamma = \delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)$ due to $\hat{\Lambda}_r \supset \hat{\mathrm{I}}_r$, and denoted

$$\begin{aligned}
& a_n^{\Lambda} \\
:= & \sum_{\mathrm{X} \not\subset \hat{\Lambda}_r} \ \sum_{\mathrm{X}_{2n},\cdots,\mathrm{X}_2 \subset \hat{\Lambda}_r} \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}),\ \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_{2n}),\ \cdots \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2),\ \delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\Big]_\gamma \cdots \Big]_\gamma\Big]_\gamma \\
= & \sum_{\substack{\mathrm{X} \not\subset \hat{\Lambda}_r \\ \mathrm{X} \cap \hat{\Lambda}_r \neq \emptyset}} \ \sum_{\mathrm{X}_{2n},\cdots,\mathrm{X}_2 \subset \hat{\Lambda}_r} \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}),\ \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_{2n}),\ \cdots \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2),\ \delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\Big]_\gamma \cdots \Big]_\gamma\Big]_\gamma \in \mathcal{F}(\hat{\Lambda}_{2r})
\end{aligned} \tag{8.61}$$

As δ_{s} is obviously a bounded map on the finite-dimensional algebra $\mathcal{F}(\hat{\Lambda}_r)(= \mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I} \cup \hat{\Lambda}_r))$ that contains $\alpha_t^{\Lambda}(A)$ and $\delta_{0,\Lambda}^{\,n}(A)$, (8.60) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_{\mathrm{s}}\big(\alpha_t^{\Lambda}(A)\big) &= \delta_{\mathrm{s}}\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(it)^n}{n!} \delta_{0,\Lambda}^{\,n}(A) \right) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(it)^n}{n!} \delta_{\mathrm{s}}\left(\delta_{0,\Lambda}^{\,n}(A)\right) \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(it)^n}{n!} \delta_{0,\Lambda}^{\,n}\big(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\big) + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(it)^n}{n!} a_n^{\Lambda} \\
&= \alpha_t^{\Lambda}\big(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\big) + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(it)^n}{n!} a_n^{\Lambda}.
\end{aligned} \tag{8.62}$$

The following (crude) estimate holds as in (8.44):

$$\frac{1}{n!}\left\|a_n^{\Lambda}\right\| \le \|A\| \cdot \exp\Big(4|\mathrm{I}| \cdot L_{\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}}\Big) \cdot {M_{\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}}}^{n}. \tag{8.63}$$

Let us then estimate

$$\left\|\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(it)^n}{n!} a_n^{\Lambda}\right\| \le \sum_{n=0}^{N} \left\|\frac{a_n^{\Lambda}}{n!} t^n\right\| + \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} \left\|\frac{a_n^{\Lambda}}{n!} t^n\right\|.$$

By (8.63), the second term of the right-hand side of this inequality is arbitrary small for $|t| < t_0$ if one takes N sufficiently large. Let such N be fixed. Then the first term becomes exactly 0 if $\Lambda(\supset \mathrm{I})$ is sufficiently large, because for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \le n \le N$

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\mathrm{X}_{2n},\cdots,\mathrm{X}_2 \subset \hat{\Lambda}_r} \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_{2n}),\ \cdots \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2),\ \delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\Big]_{\gamma} \cdots\Big]_{\gamma}\Big]_{\gamma} \\ = &\sum_{\mathrm{X}_{2n},\cdots,\mathrm{X}_2 \subset \hat{\mathrm{I}}_{2nr}} \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_{2n}),\ \cdots \Big[\Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X}_2),\ \delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\Big]_{\gamma} \cdots\Big]_{\gamma}\Big]_{\gamma} \in \mathcal{F}(\hat{\mathrm{I}}_{2nr}) \subset \mathcal{F}(\hat{\mathrm{I}}_{2Nr}) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathrm{X} \not\subset \hat{\Lambda}_r \\ \mathrm{X} \cap \hat{\Lambda}_r \neq \emptyset}} \Psi_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{X})$$

γ-commute due to the finite range assumption of Ψ_{s} yielding $a_n^{\Lambda} = 0$. Hence for $|t| < t_0$

$$\lim_{\Lambda \to \infty} \left\|\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(it)^n}{n!} a_n^{\Lambda}\right\| = 0.$$

From this and (8.62) (8.53), it follows that

$$\lim_{\Lambda \to \infty} \delta_{\mathrm{s}}\big(\alpha_t^{\Lambda}(A)\big) = \lim_{\Lambda \to \infty} \alpha_t^{\Lambda}\big(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\big) = \alpha_t\big(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\big). \tag{8.64}$$

As δ_{s} is closed in norm (8.56), noting (8.53) (8.64) we obtain

$$\alpha_t(A) \in \mathcal{D}_{\delta_{\mathrm{s}}}, \quad \delta_{\mathrm{s}}\big(\alpha_t(A)\big) = \alpha_t\big(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\big) \ \text{ for } \ |t| < t_0. \tag{8.65}$$

We shall remove the restriction of $t \in \mathbb{R}$ in (8.65). Let $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $|s| < t_0$ and $|t| < t_0$. Take $A \in \mathcal{A}_{\circ}$ and $\Lambda \Supset \mathbb{Z}^{\nu}$. By applying (8.65) to the strict local element $\alpha_s^{\Lambda}(A) \in \mathcal{A}_{\circ}$, we have

$$\delta_{\mathrm{s}}\left(\alpha_t\big(\alpha_s^{\Lambda}(A)\big)\right) = \alpha_t\left(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}\big(\alpha_s^{\Lambda}(A)\big)\right) \ \text{ for } \ |t| < t_0.$$

Hence by (8.64)

$$\lim_{\Lambda\to\infty} \alpha_t\left(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}\big(\alpha_s^{\Lambda}(A)\big)\right) = \alpha_t\left(\alpha_s\big(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\big)\right) = \alpha_{t+s}\big(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\big),$$

and $\lim_{\Lambda\to\infty}\alpha_t\big(\alpha_s^{\Lambda}(A)\big) = \alpha_{t+s}(A)$, we have

$$\alpha_{t+s}(A) \in \mathcal{D}_{\delta_{\mathrm{s}}}, \quad \delta_{\mathrm{s}}\big(\alpha_{t+s}(A)\big) = \alpha_{t+s}\big(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)\big) \ \text{ for } \ |s| < t_0,\ |t| < t_0. \tag{8.66}$$

By repeating the above extension argument we obtain (8.57).

By noting (2.10), (8.58) is shown by applying (8.57) to both $\delta_{\mathrm{s},1}$ and $\delta_{\mathrm{s},2}$, □

The standing assumptions (3.17) (3.18) (3.19) in §2 are verified by (8.57) (8.58) with (8.56) under the assumption of unbroken supersymmetry.

We are going to provide a concrete supersymmetric fermion model on one-dimensional lattice $\mathbb{Z}$. The assignment of local supercharges on $\mathbb{Z}$ is given as

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi\big(\{2j-1,\,2j,\,2j+1\}\big) \ &:= \ a_{2j+1}a_{2j}^{*}a_{2j-1} \in \mathcal{F}\big(\{2j-1,\,2j,\,2j+1\}\big)^{o},\ j\in\mathbb{Z}, \\ \Psi(\mathrm{I}) \ &:= \ 0,\ \text{otherwise}. \end{aligned} \tag{8.67}$$

By definition Ψ is 2-periodic by the lattice translation on $\mathbb{Z}$, and it is of finite range with $r=3$. Hence the condition (8.20) is automatically satisfied. For $A \in \mathcal{F}(\mathrm{I})$ with $\mathrm{I} \Subset \mathbb{Z}$, let us consider $\delta\cdot\delta(A)$ is written as (8.43) given in Lemma 8.3. For this summation formula (8.43) we only have to take the pairs X_2 and X_1 such that $\mathrm{X}_2\cap\mathrm{X}_1 \neq \emptyset$ and $\Psi(\mathrm{X}_2)\Psi(\mathrm{X}_1)\neq 0$. However, by (8.67) and (8.2), it is easy to see that such pair does not exist, and hence $\delta\cdot\delta(A)=0$. As A is an arbitrary element of $\mathcal{A}_\circ$, the nilpotent condition (8.22) of δ is verified. We now conclude that $\Psi\in\mathscr{B}$. A superderivation δ is given by the formulae (8.9) (8.11) for this Ψ.

What remains to show is the existence of a supersymmetric state with respect to the superderivation δ. The Fock state φ_1 and the so-called anti-Fock state φ_2 are uniquely determined by

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_1(a_j^{*}a_j) &= 0 \text{ for any } j\in\mathbb{Z}, \\ \varphi_2(a_j a_j^{*}) &= 0 \text{ for any } j\in\mathbb{Z}. \end{aligned} \tag{8.68}$$

For any $A\in\mathcal{A}_\circ$ and $j\in\mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \varphi_1(Aa_{2j+1}a_{2j}^{*}a_{2j-1}) &= \varphi_1(a_{2j+1}a_{2j}^{*}a_{2j-1}A), \\ 0 = \varphi_2(Aa_{2j+1}a_{2j}^{*}a_{2j-1}) &= \varphi_2(a_{2j+1}a_{2j}^{*}a_{2j-1}A), \end{aligned}$$

since by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for positive linear functionals over the $*$-algebra and (8.68),

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\varphi_1(Aa_{2j+1}a_{2j}^*a_{2j-1})\right| &\leq \sqrt{\varphi_1\left(\left(Aa_{2j+1}a_{2j}^*\right)\left(Aa_{2j+1}a_{2j}^*\right)^*\right)\varphi_1\left(a_{2j-1}^*a_{2j-1}\right)} \\ &= 0\end{aligned}$$

and similarly for the others. Hence for any $\mathrm{X} \Subset \mathbb{Z}$

$$\begin{aligned}0 = \varphi_1(A\Psi(\mathrm{X})) = \varphi_1(\Psi(\mathrm{X})A), \\ 0 = \varphi_2(A\Psi(\mathrm{X})) = \varphi_2(\Psi(\mathrm{X})A).\end{aligned}$$

From this, for any $A \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda) \subset \mathcal{A}_\circ$ with $\Lambda \Subset \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\varphi_1\big(\delta(A)\big) = \sum_{\mathrm{X}\cap\Lambda\neq\emptyset} \varphi_1\big([\Psi(\mathrm{X}),\ A]_\gamma\big) = 0, \tag{8.69}$$

and similarly

$$\varphi_2\big(\delta(A)\big) = 0. \tag{8.70}$$

Thus, both φ_1 and φ_2 are invariant under δ on $\mathcal{A}_\circ$, namely they are supersymmetric.

8.2 Case (II); a supersymmetric quantum field model

We shall review the C^*-algebraic formulation of a free supersymmetric model on one-dimensional space $\mathbb{R}$ due to [17]. We show that this fulfills all the assumptions for Case (II) stated in §2 §3.2.

As before $\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})$ denotes the set of $\mathbb{R}$-valued functions of rapid decrease on $\mathbb{R}$. Let $\mathrm{Cliff}\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})\big)$ denote the Clifford (fermion) algebra generated by the operators $\{c(f) \mid f \in \mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})\}$ satisfying $\{c(f), c(g)\} = (f, g)1$ and $c(f) = c(f)^*$, where $(f, g) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x)g(x)dx$. Let $\mathcal{R}\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}), \sigma\big)$ denote the resolvent (boson) algebra on the symplectic space $\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}), \sigma\big)$, where σ is a non-degenerate symplectic bilinear form on $\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})$. We shall take $\sigma(f, g) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x)g'(x)dx$, $f, g \in \mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})$ as in [17]. The following is a summary of $\mathcal{R}\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}), \sigma\big)$. First consider a unital $*$-algebra algebraically generated by $\big\{R(\lambda,\ f) \mid f \in \mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}), \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\big\}$ that satisfy the following relations [17, Def.3.2]: $R(\lambda,\ f)^* = R(-\lambda,\ f)$, $R(\lambda,\ f) = \frac{1}{\lambda}R\big(1,\ \frac{f}{\lambda}\big)$, $R(\lambda,\ f) - R(\mu,\ f) = i(\mu-\lambda)R(\lambda,\ f)R(\mu,\ f)$, $[R(\lambda,\ f),\ R(\mu,\ g)] = i\sigma(f,\ g)R(\lambda,\ f)R(\mu,\ g)^2R(\lambda,\ f)$, $R(\lambda,\ f)R(\mu,\ g) = R(\lambda+\mu,\ f+g)\big(R(\lambda,\ f) + R(\mu,\ g) + i\sigma(f, g)R(\lambda,\ f)^2R(\mu,\ g)\big)$. The element $R(\lambda,\ f)$ is *formally* written as $\big(i\lambda 1 - j(f)\big)^{-1}$, where $j(f)$ will indicate the hermite boson field corresponding to $f \in \mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})$. It is easy to see that these algebraic relations for the resolvent elements come from the canonical commutation relations (CCR): $[j(f),\ j(g)] = i\sigma(f, g)1$, $j(f)^* = j(f)$, $f, g \in \mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})$. The unital $*$-algebra generated by the resolvent elements becomes a C^*-algebra $\mathcal{R}\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}), \sigma\big)$ endowed with a C^*-norm. See the explanation shortly after [17, Def.3.2][13]. As defined in [17, Def.3.5], a representation

---

[13] The possible C^*-norms of the resolvent algebra are discussed in details in [34].

π of the C^*-algebra $\mathcal{R}\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}),\,\sigma\big)$ (or of the total system $\mathcal{R}\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}),\,\sigma\big)\otimes\mathrm{Cliff}\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})\big)$) on a Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}_\pi$ is called *regular*, if

$$\mathrm{Ker}\,\pi\big(R(1,\,f)\big)=0 \text{ for any } f\in\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}). \tag{8.71}$$

For such π, we can define a field operator $j_\pi(f):=iI-\pi\big(R(\lambda,\,f)\big)^{-1}$ for $f\in\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})$, where I is the identity operator on $\mathscr{H}_\pi$. Conversely, we have $\pi\big(R(\lambda,\,f)\big)=\big(i\lambda I-j_\pi(f)\big)^{-1}$.

The total (fermion-boson) system is given by the tensor-product of the Clifford algebra and the resolvent algebra,

$$\mathcal{F}:=\mathrm{Cliff}\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})\big)\otimes\mathcal{R}\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}),\,\sigma\big). \tag{8.72}$$

The grading automorphism γ on $\mathcal{F}$ is given by $\gamma_{\mathrm{c}}\otimes i_{\mathcal{R}}$, where γ_{c} is the automorphism on $\mathrm{Cliff}\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})\big)$ uniquely determined by $\gamma_{\mathrm{c}}\big(c(f)\big)=-c(f)$, and $i_{\mathcal{R}}$ is the identity map on $\mathcal{R}\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}),\,\sigma\big)$.

The superderivation that we will formulate is *formally* written by $\delta_{\mathrm{s}}\big(c(f)\big)=j(f)$ and $\delta_{\mathrm{s}}\big(j(f)\big)=ic(f')$ [17, §2] in terms of (unbounded) field operators. Note $\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(c(f))=j(f)\notin\mathcal{F}$. To formulate the corresponding superderivation within the C^*-algebra $\mathcal{F}$, we need to mollify *raw* $c(f)$ in the following manner [17, §4]:

$$\zeta(f):=c(f)R(1,\,f)\in\mathcal{F}. \tag{8.73}$$

Let

$$\mathcal{A}_\circ:=*\text{-alg}\big\{1,\ \zeta(f),\ R(\lambda,\,f)\mid f\in\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}),\ \lambda\in\mathbb{R}\big\}\subset\mathcal{F}, \tag{8.74}$$

i.e. the unital $*$-subalgebra algebraically generated by the mollified fermionic elements and the bosonic resolvent elements, and let

$$\mathcal{F}_0:=*\text{-alg}\big\{1,\ c(f),\ R(\lambda,\,f)\mid f\in\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}),\ \lambda\in\mathbb{R}\big\}\subset\mathcal{F}. \tag{8.75}$$

By definition $\mathcal{F}_0\supset\mathcal{A}_\circ$ and $\mathcal{F}_0$ is norm dense in $\mathcal{F}$[14]. On the other hand, $\mathcal{A}_\circ$ is not norm dense in $\mathcal{F}$. It has been shown that $\mathcal{A}_\circ$ is strongly operator dense (3.20) in any regular representation, as there exists a sequence of bosonic resolvent elements converging to the identity operator in the strong operator topology for such representation [17, Th.3.6(ii)], see (8.79) (8.80). Let

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(\zeta(f)) &:= iR(1,\,f)-1+ic(f)c(f')R(1,\,f)^2\in\mathcal{F}_0,\\ \delta_{\mathrm{s}}(R(1,\,f)) &:= ic(f')R(1,\,f)^2\in\mathcal{F}_0.\end{aligned} \tag{8.76}$$

It has been shown [17, §4] that (8.76) gives a symmetric superderivation $\delta_{\mathrm{s}}:\mathcal{A}_\circ\to\mathcal{F}_0(\subset\mathcal{F})$.

---

[14] Our $\mathcal{A}_\circ$ (8.74) and $\mathcal{F}_0$ (8.75) are denoted respectively by '$\mathcal{D}_S$' and by '$\mathcal{A}_0$' in [17, §4].

The infinitesimal time development is *formally* given as $\delta_0\big(c(f)\big) = \delta_{\mathrm{s}}\cdot\delta_{\mathrm{s}}\big(c(f)\big) = ic(f')$ and $\delta_0\big(j(f)\big) = \delta_{\mathrm{s}}\cdot\delta_{\mathrm{s}}\big(j(f)\big) = ij(f')$. The corresponding global time development is given by the Bogoljubov-automorphism group with respect to shift-translation on the phase space $\mathbb{R}$ as

$$\alpha_t(c(f)) := c(f_t), \quad \alpha_t(R(1,\, f)) := R(1,\, f_t), \tag{8.77}$$

where $f_t(x) = f(x-t)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$. This determines a one-parameter group of $*$-automorphisms α_t $(t \in \mathbb{R})$ on the whole $\mathcal{F}$ by tensor-product:

$$\alpha_t(F_1 \otimes F_2) = \alpha_t(F_1) \otimes \alpha_t(F_2), \quad F_1 \in \mathrm{Cliff}\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})\big),\ \mathrm{F}_2 \in \mathcal{R}\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}),\, \sigma\big) \tag{8.78}$$

By definition $\alpha_t(\zeta(f)) = \zeta(f_t)$ and hence

$$\alpha_t(\mathcal{A}_\circ) = \mathcal{A}_\circ \text{ for each } t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

We have now verified (3.24).

For each $A \in \mathcal{A}_\circ$, its mollifier $M_{A,\lambda} \in 1 \otimes \mathcal{R}\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}),\, \sigma\big)$ satisfying (3.25) (3.26) (3.27) (for any state ω whose GNS representation is regular) is given as a monomial of resolvent elements $R(\lambda,\, f)$ [17, Def.4.3]. For completeness, let us add tedious explanation about this statement in what follows. As $\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathcal{A}_\circ)$ is included in $\mathcal{F}_0$, it suffices to show that for any $B \in \mathcal{F}_0$ there exists a net $\big\{N_{\{B,\lambda\}} \in 1 \otimes \mathcal{R}\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}),\, \sigma\big); \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+\big\}$ satisfying for each λ

$$N_{\{B,\lambda\}} B \in \mathcal{A}_\circ, \tag{8.79}$$

and as $\lambda \to \infty$,

$$\pi_\omega(N_{\{B,\lambda\}}) \longrightarrow I \quad \text{in the strong operator topology of } \mathfrak{B}(\mathscr{H}_\omega), \tag{8.80}$$

$$\pi_\omega\big(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(N_{\{B,\lambda\}})\big) \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{in the strong operator topology of } \mathfrak{B}(\mathscr{H}_\omega), \tag{8.81}$$

where the GNS representation $\big(\pi_\omega,\, \mathscr{H}_\omega,\, \Omega_\omega\big)$ of a state ω is assumed to be regular. These obviously imply (3.25) (3.26) (3.27) by taking $M_{A,\lambda} = N_{\{B,\lambda\}}$ and $B = \delta_{\mathrm{s}}(A)$ for any given $A \in \mathcal{A}_\circ$. For $c(f) \in \mathcal{F}_0$

$$N_{\{c(f),\lambda\}} := iR\big(1,\, \tfrac{f}{\lambda}\big)(= i\lambda R(\lambda,\, f)), \tag{8.82}$$

while for $R(\lambda,\, f) \in \mathcal{F}_0$

$$N_{\{R(1,\,f),\lambda\}} := 1. \tag{8.83}$$

By [17, Th.3.6(ii)],

$$\lim_{\lambda\to\infty}\pi_\omega(N_{\{c(f),\lambda\}})\longrightarrow I \quad \text{in the strong operator topology of } \mathfrak{B}(\mathscr{H}_\omega). \tag{8.84}$$

By (8.76) $\delta_{\mathrm{s}}\big(R(1,\,\frac{f}{\lambda})\big)=ic(\frac{f'}{\lambda})R\big(1,\,\frac{f}{\lambda}\big)^2$,

$$\lim_{\lambda\to\infty}\pi_\omega\big(\delta_{\mathrm{s}}(N_{\{c(f),\lambda\}})\big)=\lim_{\lambda\to\infty}\frac{-1}{\lambda}\pi_\omega\left(c(f')\right)\pi_\omega\big(R\big(1,\,\tfrac{f}{\lambda}\big)^2\big)\longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{in norm}, \tag{8.85}$$

as $\|c(f')\|=\sqrt{\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}}\{f'(x)\}^2dx}{2}}$ and $\|R\big(1,\,\frac{f}{\lambda}\big)\|=1$ (by [17, Th.3.4(ii)]) are bounded. For a monomial

$$B_1=c(f_1)\cdots c(f_n)R(\kappa_1,\,g_1)\cdots R(\kappa_m,\,g_m)\in\mathcal{F}_0,$$

let

$$N_{\{B_1,\lambda\}}:=N_{\{c(f_1),\lambda\}}\cdots N_{\{c(f_n),\lambda\}}=iR(1,\,\tfrac{f_1}{\lambda})\cdots iR(1,\,\tfrac{f_n}{\lambda}). \tag{8.86}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
N_{\{B_1,\lambda\}}B_1 &= \Big(iR(1,\,\tfrac{f_1}{\lambda})\cdots iR(1,\,\tfrac{f_n}{\lambda})\Big)\Big(c(f_1)\cdots c(f_n)\Big)\Big(R(\kappa_1,\,g_1)\cdots R(\kappa_m,\,g_m)\Big)\\
&= i^n\big(c(f_1)R(1,\,\tfrac{f_1}{\lambda})\big)\cdots\big(c(f_n)R(1,\,\tfrac{f_n}{\lambda})\big)\cdot\Big(R(\kappa_1,\,g_1)\cdots R(\kappa_m,\,g_m)\Big)\\
&= (i\lambda)^n\big(c(\tfrac{f_1}{\lambda})R(1,\,\tfrac{f_1}{\lambda})\big)\cdots\big(c(\tfrac{f_n}{\lambda})R(1,\,\tfrac{f_n}{\lambda})\big)\cdot\Big(R(\kappa_1,\,g_1)\cdots R(\kappa_m,\,g_m)\Big)\\
&= (i\lambda)^n\zeta(\tfrac{f_1}{\lambda})\cdots\zeta(\tfrac{f_n}{\lambda})\cdot R(\kappa_1,\,g_1)\cdots R(\kappa_m,\,g_m)\in\mathcal{A}_\circ,
\end{aligned}$$

so (8.79) is satisfied. For $B_1\in\mathcal{F}_0$ and $N_{\{B_1,\lambda\}}$ given above, (8.80) holds due to (8.84), while (8.81) holds due to (8.85) by noting (2.4). Take another monomial $B_2=c(h_1)\cdots c(h_{n'})R(\iota_1,\,k_1)\cdots R(\iota_{m'},\,k_{m'})\in\mathcal{F}_0$. For $c_1B_1+c_2B_2\in\mathcal{F}_0$, $c_1,c_2\in\mathbb{C}$, let

$$N_{\{c_1B_1+c_2B_2,\lambda\}}:=N_{\{B_1,\lambda\}}N_{\{B_2,\lambda\}}=\Big(iR(1,\,\tfrac{f_1}{\lambda})\cdots iR(1,\,\tfrac{f_n}{\lambda})\Big)\Big(iR(1,\,\tfrac{h_1}{\lambda})\cdots iR(1,\,\tfrac{h_{n'}}{\lambda})\Big) \tag{8.87}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&N_{\{c_1B_1+c_2B_2,\lambda\}}(c_1B_1+c_2B_2)\\
=\;& c_1N_{\{B_1,\lambda\}}N_{\{B_2,\lambda\}}B_1+c_2N_{\{B_1,\lambda\}}N_{\{B_2,\lambda\}}B_2\\
=\;& c_1\Big(iR(1,\,\tfrac{f_1}{\lambda})\cdots iR(1,\,\tfrac{f_n}{\lambda})\Big)\Big(c(f_1)\cdots c(f_n)\Big)\Big(iR(1,\,\tfrac{h_1}{\lambda})\cdots iR(1,\,\tfrac{h_{n'}}{\lambda})\Big)\Big(R(\kappa_1,\,g_1)\cdots R(\kappa_m,\,g_m)\Big)\\
+\;& c_2\Big(iR(1,\,\tfrac{f_1}{\lambda})\cdots iR(1,\,\tfrac{f_n}{\lambda})\Big)\Big(iR(1,\,\tfrac{h_1}{\lambda})\cdots iR(1,\,\tfrac{h_{n'}}{\lambda})\Big)\Big(c(h_1)\cdots c(h_{n'})\Big)\Big(R(\iota_1,\,k_1)\cdots R(\iota_{m'},\,k_{m'})\Big)\\
\\
=\;& c_1(i\lambda)^n(i)^{n'}(\zeta(\tfrac{f_1}{\lambda})\cdots\zeta(\tfrac{f_n}{\lambda}))\Big(R(1,\,\tfrac{h_1}{\lambda})\cdots R(1,\,\tfrac{h_{n'}}{\lambda})\Big)\Big(R(\kappa_1,\,g_1)\cdots R(\kappa_m,\,g_m)\Big)\\
+\;& c_2(i\lambda)^{n'}(i)^n\Big(R(1,\,\tfrac{f_1}{\lambda})\cdots R(1,\,\tfrac{f_n}{\lambda})\Big)(\zeta(\tfrac{h_1}{\lambda})\cdots\zeta(\tfrac{h_{n'}}{\lambda}))\Big(R(\iota_1,\,k_1)\cdots R(\iota_{m'},\,k_{m'})\Big)\in\mathcal{A}_\circ,
\end{aligned}$$

so (8.79) is satisfied. Due to (8.84) (8.85) (8.87) both (8.80) and (8.81) are satisfied for $c_1B_1+c_2B_2$. Finally, take an arbitrary $B \in \mathcal{F}_0$, which is written as a linear sum $\sum_{i=1}^{p} c_iB_i$, where $c_i \in \mathbb{C}$ and each B_i is a monomial of $\mathcal{F}_0$. Let

$$N_{\{B,\lambda\}} := N_{\{B_1,\lambda\}}N_{\{B_2,\lambda\}}\cdots N_{\{B_p,\lambda\}}. \tag{8.88}$$

Then by repeating essentially same argument as that for $c_1B_1+c_2B_2$ (i.e. $p=2$) given above, (8.79) (8.80) (8.80) are verified for this B.

We are going to provide a regular supersymmetric state on $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to δ_{s} (8.76). On $\mathrm{Cliff}\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})\big)$, we take a quasi-free state φ_{fer} with the two point function

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_{\mathrm{fer}}\big(c(f)c(g)\big) \;&\equiv\; \langle f,\, g\rangle_{\varphi_{\mathrm{fer}}} := \int_0^\infty \hat{f}(p)\overline{\hat{g}(p)}dp \\ &= \int_0^\infty \hat{f}(p)\hat{g}(-p)dp,\ \ f,g\in\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}),\end{aligned} \tag{8.89}$$

where $\hat{f}(p)$ $(\hat{g}(p))$ $(p\in\mathbb{R})$ denotes the Fourier transform of $f(x)$ $(g(x))$ $(x\in\mathbb{R})$. We note $\overline{\hat{g}(p)}=\hat{g}(-p)$ as $g(x)$ is $\mathbb{R}$-valued. We can write

$$\langle f,\, g\rangle_{\varphi_{\mathrm{fer}}} = s_{\mathrm{f}}(f,\, g) + i s_{\mathrm{f}}(Af,\, g), \tag{8.90}$$

where $s_{\mathrm{f}}(f,g) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(f,g) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x)g(x)dx = \frac{1}{2}\int_0^\infty \Big(\hat{f}(p)\hat{g}(-p)+\hat{f}(-p)\hat{g}(p)\Big)dp$, $\widehat{Af}(p) := \frac{1}{i}\Big(\chi(p\ge 0)\hat{f}(p) - \chi(p<0)\hat{f}(p)\Big)$, χ denotes the characteristic function (on p-space). By $A^{+}=-A$ with respect to s_{f} and $A^2=-1$, (8.90) gives a complex structure on the euclidean space $(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}),\, s_{\mathrm{f}})$. Hence φ_{fer} defined by (8.89) is a Fock state on $\mathrm{Cliff}\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})\big)$.

To provide a desired (quasi-free) state on $\mathcal{R}\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}),\,\sigma\big)$, we first consider the Weyl algebra $\overline{\Delta\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}),\,\sigma\big)}$ on the symplectic space $\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}),\,\sigma\big)$ which is generated by a set of unitaries $\big\{\delta_f \mid f\in\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})\big\}$ satisfying $\delta_f^* = \delta_{-f}$, $\delta_f\delta_g = e^{-i\sigma(f,\,g)/2}\delta_{f+g}$. Define the following scalar product on $\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})$

$$\langle f,\, g\rangle_{\varphi_{\mathrm{bos}}} := \int_0^\infty p\hat{f}(p)\overline{\hat{g}(p)}dp = \int_0^\infty p\hat{f}(p)\hat{g}(-p)dp,\ \ f,g\in\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}). \tag{8.91}$$

Let[15]

$$s_{\mathrm{b}}(f,\, g) := \frac{\langle f,\, g\rangle_{\varphi_{\mathrm{bos}}} + \langle g,\, f\rangle_{\varphi_{\mathrm{bos}}}}{2}. \tag{8.92}$$

It is immediate to see

$$\begin{aligned}\langle f,\, g\rangle_{\varphi_{\mathrm{bos}}} - \langle g,\, f\rangle_{\varphi_{\mathrm{bos}}} \;&=\; \int_0^\infty p\hat{f}(p)\hat{g}(-p)dp - \int_0^\infty p\hat{f}(-p)\hat{g}(p)dp = \int_{-\infty}^\infty p\hat{f}(p)\hat{g}(-p)dp \\ &=\; i\sqrt{2}\sigma(f,g).\end{aligned} \tag{8.93}$$

---

[15] Our notation is different from [17].

The quasi-free state φ_{bos} on $\overline{\Delta\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}),\,\sigma\big)}$ is determined by

$$\varphi_{\mathrm{bos}}(\delta_f) = \exp\left(\frac{-s_{\mathrm{b}}(f,\,f)}{2}\right) = \exp\left(\frac{-\langle f,\,f\rangle_{\varphi_{\mathrm{bos}}}}{2}\right), \quad f \in \mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}). \tag{8.94}$$

Due to the complex structure

$$\langle f,\,g\rangle_{\varphi_{\mathrm{bos}}} = s_{\mathrm{b}}(f,\,g) + \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}\sigma(f,\,g) \tag{8.95}$$

on the symplectic space $\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}),\,\sigma\big)$, φ_{bos} defined as (8.94) is a Fock state on $\overline{\Delta\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}),\,\sigma\big)}$. From the formula [17, Eq.(10)] that makes use of the Laplace transformation, the expectation values on the monomials of resolvent elements are given as

$$\varphi_{\mathrm{bos}}\left(R(\lambda_1,\,f_1)\cdots R(\lambda_n,\,f_n)\right) = (-i)^n \int_0^\infty dt_1 \cdots \int_0^\infty dt_n e^{-\sum_k t_k\lambda_k} \varphi_{\mathrm{bos}}\left(\delta_{t_1 f_1}\cdots\delta_{t_n f_n}\right) \tag{8.96}$$

By this we define a (quasi-free) state φ_{bos} on $\mathcal{R}\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}),\,\sigma\big)$.

The state φ on the whole system $\mathrm{Cliff}\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})\big) \otimes \mathcal{R}\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}),\,\sigma\big)$ is given by the product state of φ_{fer} and φ_{bos}, i.e.

$$\varphi := \varphi_{\mathrm{fer}} \otimes \varphi_{\mathrm{bos}}. \tag{8.97}$$

Let $\big(\pi_{\varphi_{\mathrm{fer}}},\,\mathscr{H}_{\varphi_{\mathrm{fer}}},\,\Omega_{\varphi_{\mathrm{fer}}}\big)$ denote the GNS triplet for φ_{fer} on $\mathrm{Cliff}\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})\big)$, and let $\big(\pi_{\varphi_{\mathrm{bos}}},\,\mathscr{H}_{\varphi_{\mathrm{bos}}},\,\Omega_{\varphi_{\mathrm{bos}}}\big)$ denote that for φ_{bos} on $\mathcal{R}\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}),\,\sigma\big)$. The GNS triplet $\big(\pi_\varphi,\,\mathscr{H}_\varphi,\,\Omega_\varphi\big)$ for the product quasi-free Fock state φ on the fermion-boson system $\mathrm{Cliff}\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})\big) \otimes \mathcal{R}\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}),\,\sigma\big)$ is given by $\pi_\varphi := \pi_{\varphi_{\mathrm{fer}}} \otimes \pi_{\varphi_{\mathrm{bos}}}$, $\mathscr{H}_\varphi := \mathscr{H}_{\varphi_{\mathrm{fer}}} \otimes \mathscr{H}_{\varphi_{\mathrm{bos}}}$, and $\Omega_\varphi := \Omega_{\varphi_{\mathrm{fer}}} \otimes \Omega_{\varphi_{\mathrm{bos}}}$. As is remarked [17, Def.3.5], the Fock representation $\big(\pi_{\varphi_{\mathrm{bos}}},\,\mathscr{H}_{\varphi_{\mathrm{bos}}},\,\Omega_{\varphi_{\mathrm{bos}}}\big)$ of $\mathcal{R}\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}),\,\sigma\big)$ is regular. Hence by construction, the above $\big(\pi_\varphi,\,\mathscr{H}_\varphi,\,\Omega_\varphi\big)$ gives a regular representation of $\mathcal{F}$, and for each $f \in \mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})$ there exists a boson field operator $j_{\pi_\varphi}(f) = I \otimes j_{\pi_{\varphi_{\mathrm{bos}}}}(f)$ on $\mathscr{H}_{\varphi_{\mathrm{fer}}} \otimes \mathscr{H}_{\varphi_{\mathrm{bos}}}$ whose domain contains $\pi_\varphi(\mathcal{F}_0)\Omega_\varphi$, see the explanation below [17, Th.3.6]. By (8.77) (8.78) (8.89) (8.91) (8.94) (8.96) (8.97), φ is invariant under α_t. Thus there exists a σ-weakly continuous one-parameter group of $*$-automorphisms $\tilde{\alpha}_t$ of $\mathfrak{M}_\varphi$ (the von Neumann algebra generated by the GNS representation for φ) such that

$$\pi_\varphi\left(\alpha_t(F)\right) = \tilde{\alpha}_t\left(\pi_\varphi(F)\right) = U(t)\pi_\varphi(F)U(t)^{-1},\ U(t) \equiv e^{itH}, \quad \text{for every} \quad t \in \mathbb{R} \quad \text{and} \quad F \in \mathcal{F} \tag{8.98}$$

where H is a self-adjoint operator satisfying

$$H\Omega_\varphi = 0. \tag{8.99}$$

By (8.98) obviously the standing assumption (3.21) is satisfied.

It is easy to see

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\pi_{\varphi_{\mathrm{fer}}}\big(\alpha_t(c(f))\big)\Omega_{\varphi_{\mathrm{fer}}}\Big|_{t=0} &= -\pi_{\varphi_{\mathrm{fer}}}\big(c(f')\big)\Omega_{\varphi_{\mathrm{fer}}}, \\ \frac{d}{dt}\pi_{\varphi_{\mathrm{bos}}}\big(\alpha_t(R(1,\, f))\big)\Omega_{\varphi_{\mathrm{bos}}}\Big|_{t=0} &= -j_{\pi_{\varphi_{\mathrm{bos}}}}(f')\pi_{\varphi_{\mathrm{bos}}}(R(1,\, f)^2)\Omega_{\varphi_{\mathrm{bos}}}. \end{aligned} \tag{8.100}$$

From (8.98) (8.99) (8.100) and the tensor-product structure of α_t and φ between $\mathrm{Cliff}\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})\big)$ and $\mathcal{R}\big(\mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R}),\, \sigma\big)$ as (8.78) (8.97), by using the Leibniz rule, it follows that

$$\frac{d}{dt}U(t)\pi_{\varphi}(A)\Omega_{\varphi}\Big|_{t=0} = \frac{d}{dt}\pi_{\varphi}\big(\alpha_t(A)\big)\Omega_{\varphi}\Big|_{t=0}$$

exists for any $A \in \mathcal{F}_0$, hence obviously for any $A \in \mathcal{A}_{\circ}$. Hence (3.22) is verified.

The weak infinitesimal supersymmetric dynamics (3.29) of Definition 3.14. can be verified by the same reasoning in [17, Th.5.8(iii)].

We should finally see that φ is supersymmetric with respect to δ, namely, $\varphi \circ \delta_{\mathrm{s}}$ takes 0 on every element of $\mathcal{A}_{\circ}$. It suffices to check this on all the monomials of $\mathcal{A}_{\circ}$ which have the following general form

$$\zeta(f_1)\cdots\zeta(f_n)R(\lambda_1,\, g_1)\cdots R(\lambda_m,\, g_m) = c(f_1)\cdots c(f_n)R(1,\, f_1)\cdots R(1,\, f_n)R(\lambda_1,\, g_1)\cdots R(\lambda_m,\, g_m) \in \mathcal{A}_{\circ}.$$

From the direct computation in the proof of [17, Th.5.8(ii)],

$$\begin{aligned} &\varphi\circ\delta_{\mathrm{s}}\big(c(f_1)\cdots c(f_n)R(1,\, f_1)\cdots R(1,\, f_n)R(\lambda_1,\, g_1)\cdots R(\lambda_m,\, g_m)\big) \\ =\ &\sum_{k=1}^{n}(-1)^{k+1}\varphi\left(c(f_1)\cdots \overset{k}{\vee}\cdots c(f_n)\right)\left\{\sum_{r=1}^{n}\Big(\langle f_k,\, f_r\rangle_{\varphi_{\mathrm{bos}}} - i\varphi\left(c(f_k)c(f_r')\right)\Big)\right. \\ &\qquad\times\varphi\left(R(1,\, f_1)\cdots R(1,\, f_r)^2\cdots R(1,\, f_n)R(\lambda_1,\, g_1)\cdots R(\lambda_m,\, g_m)\right) \\ +\ &\left.\sum_{p=1}^{m}\Big(\langle f_k,\, g_p\rangle_{\varphi_{\mathrm{bos}}} - i\varphi\big(c(f_k)c(g_p')\big)\Big)\times\varphi\left(R(1,\, f_1)\cdots R(1,\, f_n)R(\lambda_1,\, g_1)\cdots R(\lambda_p,\, g_p)^2\cdots R(\lambda_m,\, g_m)\right)\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By (8.89) (8.91) (8.97), for any $f, g \in \mathscr{S}(\mathbb{R})$

$$\varphi\big(c(f)c(g')\big) = \varphi_{\mathrm{fer}}\big(c(f)c(g')\big) = \int_0^{\infty} -ip\hat{f}(p)\hat{g}(-p)dp = -i\langle f,\, g\rangle_{\varphi_{\mathrm{bos}}}.$$

Hence we obtain the desired result,

$$\varphi\circ\delta_{\mathrm{s}}\big(c(f_1)\cdots c(f_n)R(1,\, f_1)\cdots R(1,\, f_n)R(\lambda_1,\, g_1)\cdots R(\lambda_m,\, g_m)\big) = 0.$$

Remark 8.10. We hope that the foregoing discussions will stimulate a comprehensive study for superderivations in C^*-systems. Let us provide the following problems. Some of them are related to Remark 8.1 and Remark 8.8 in §8.1. Some suggest extensions of the existing results for even derivations [5, 16] to the case of superderivations.

1. Provide conditions under which a superderivation is closed.
2. Provide conditions under which a superderivation is closable.

3. Classify superderivations in (on) a graded C^*-algebra.

4. Classify nilpotent superderivations in (on) a graded C^*-algebra.

5. Provide other examples of supersymmetric C^*-dynamics and determine broken-unbroken supersymmetry for them.

6. Extend (or apply) our formulation of supersymmetric C^*-dynamics to the situation not treated either in Case (I) nor Case (II).

References

[1] D. Buchholz, *On the implementation of supersymmetry.* Lect. Notes in Phys. **539** (2000), 221–220.

[2] J. Łopuszański, *An introduction to symmetry and supersymmetry in quantum field theory.* World Scientific, 1991.

[3] R. F. Streater, A. S. Wightman, *PCT, spin and statistics, and all that.* Princeton University Press, 2000.

[4] R. Haag, *Local Quantum Physics.* 2nd Edition, Springer-Verlag, 1996.

[5] O. Bratteli, D. W. Robinson, *Operator Algebras and Quantum Statistical Mechanics 1.* 2nd Edition, Springer-Verlag, 1987. *Operator Algebras and Quantum Statistical Mechanics 2.* 2nd Edition, Springer-Verlag, 1996.

[6] G. G. Emch, *Algebraic methods in statistical mechanics and quantum field theory.* Dover, 2009.

[7] D. Ruelle, *Statistical Mechanics, Rigorous Results.* Benjamin, 1969.

[8] S. Weinberg, *The quantum theory of fields III.* Cambridge University Press, 2000.

[9] J. Wess, J. Bagger, *Supersymmetry and supergravity. 2nd edition.* Princeton University Press, 1991.

[10] D. Buchholz, S. Doplicher, R. Longo, J. E. Roberts, *On Noether's theorem in quantum field theory.* Ann. Phys. **170** (1986), 1–17.

[11] R. Haag, J. T. Łopuszański, M. Sohnius, *All possible generators of supersymmetries of the S Matrix.* Nucl. Phys. **B88** (1975), 257-274.

[12] J. Iliopoulos, B. Zumino, *Broken supergauge symmetry and renormalization.* Nucl. Phys. **B76** (1974), 310–332.

[13] G. Morchio, F. Strocchi, *A remark on spontaneous breaking of supersymmetry.* Phys. Lett. **B118** (1982), 340-342.

[14] D. Buchholz, I. Ojima, *Spontaneous collapse of supersymmetry.* Nucl. Phys. **B498** (1997), 228–242.

[15] H. Nikolai, *Supersymmetry and spin systems.* J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **9** (1976), 1497–1505.

[16] S. Sakai, *Operator algebras in dynamical systems.* Cambridge University Press, 1991.

[17] D. Buchholz, H. Grundling, *Algebraic supersymmetry: a case study.* Commun. Math. Phys. **272** (2007), 699–750.

[18] E. Witten, *Dynamical breaking of supersymmetry.* Nucl. Phys. **B185** (1981), 513–554.

[19] I. Gelfand, M. Neumark, *On the imbedding of normed rings into the ring of operators in Hilbert space.* Math. Sbornik. **12** (1943), 197–217.

[20] I. E. Segal, *Irreducible representations of operator algebras.* Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **53** (1947), 73–88.

[21] A. Jaffe, A. Lesniewski, K. Osterwalder, *Quantum K-theory. I. The Chern character.* Commun. Math. Phys. **118** (1988), 1–14.

[22] O. Bratteli, D. W. Robinson, *Unbounded derivations of C^*-algebras.* Commun. Math. Phys. **42** (1975), 253–268.

[23] A. Arai, *Path integral representation of the index of Kähler-Dirac operators on an infinite dimensional manifold.* J. Funct. Anal. **82** (1989), 330–369.

[24] C. Carmeli, G. Cassinelli, A. Toigo, V. S. Varadarajan, *Unitary representations of super Lie groups and applications to the classification and multiplet structure of super particles.* Commun. Math. Phys. **263** (2006), 217–258.

[25] H. Grosse, E. Langmann, *A superderivation of quasifree second quantization. I: Charged particles* J. Math. Phys. **33**(3) (1992), 1032–1045.

[26] A. Jaffe, A. Lesniewski, *Supersymmetric field theory and infinite dimensional analysis.* Nonperturbative Quantum Field Theory, Proceedings of the 1987 Cargèse Summer School, G. 't Hooft et. al., Editors, Plenum Press (1988), 227–280.

[27] B. Thaller, *The Dirac equation.* Springer-Verlag, 1992.

[28] H. Aoyama, D. Boyanovsky, *Goldstone fermions in supersymmetric theories at finite temperature.* Phys. Rev. **D30** (1984), 1356–1363.

[29] N. Seiberg, *Exact results on the space of vacua of four-dimensional SUSY gauge theories.* Phys. Rev. **D49** (1994), 6857-6863.

[30] H. Moriya, *On fermion grading symmetry for quasi-local systems.* Commun. Math. Phys. **264** (2006), 411–426.

[31] A. Kishimoto, H. Nakamura, *Super-derivations.* Commun. Math. Phys. **159** (1994), 15–27.

[32] H. Araki, *On the algebra of all local observables.* Prog. Theor. Phys. **32** (1964), 844-854.

[33] M. Reed, B. Simon, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics I: Functional Analysis.* Revised and Enlarged Edition, Academic Press, 1980. *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics II: Fourier Analysis, Self-Adjointness* Revised and Enlarged Edition, Academic Press, 1975.

[34] D. Buchholz, H. Grundling, *The resolvent algebra: A new approach to canonical quantum systems.* J. Func. Anal. **254** (2008), 2725-2779.

Acknowledgment

I thank Detlev Buchholz for discussion. I thank Asao Arai and Akitaka Kishimoto for drawing my attention to their works. I am indebted to a number of theoretical physicists for enlightening conversation. This work is partly supported by jsps-kakenhi 21740128.